ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

HAMPTON, TARIN T. D. B.S. DEPAUL UNIVERSITY, 1975

M.A. BUTLER UNIVERSITY, 1976

ASSESSING COHERENCY IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP

Advisor: Professor Claudette Williams

Dissertation dated May, 2003

This study examines 14 indicators of coherence in teacher education programs that can be utilized to assess teacher education programs for their ability to produce high quality successful teachers. The indicators were further developed into a protocol for the purpose of assessment.

This study was based on the premise that these fourteen indicators would assess coherency in any teacher education program to determine the areas in which the program was performing successfully in providing quality teaching in its teacher preparation program, and in which areas it was not performing successfully. This provided firsthand knowledge for the professors to utilize in making informed decisions about the weak areas of their program.

A case study analysis approach was used to test the protocol, and the data gathered is reported in the text of this document as it was reported to the program that is the subject of the case study.

The researcher found that the protocol developed can be very instrumental in providing faculty teaching in teacher education programs with valuable information which will assist them in making informed decisions about their program from numerous perspectives.

The conclusions drawn from the findings suggest that if programs of teacher education utilize this protocol to assess their programs' level of coherency, they will also identify their programs' strengths and weaknesses. They will also be able to make valuable informed decisions about needed changes they should make in the program and maintain aspects of the program that are strong. With all faculty members of a program buying into the process, it can be very successful in improving from the inside out, instead of waiting until students graduate to find out that they are inadequately prepared for the teaching profession.

ASSESSING COHERENCY IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

TARIN T.D. HAMPTON

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

MAY 2003

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to my father, Martin L. Dumas Sr., and my mother Catherine S. Dumas, for their strong encouragement and the emphasis they placed on the importance of education to one's life. Additional thanks go out to my husband, Mouncef Boutahari, my three children, Jamiel, Tajiana, and Jatari, my sisters, Pamela Butler and Sherida Edwards, brother-in-law, Bruce Butler, and to my extended family for their patience, sacrifices, and assistance over the years in helping me complete this degree. Special thanks are also extended to my committee professors, Dr. Claudette Williams, Dr. Trevor Turner, Dr. Robert Dixon, Dr. Leslie Fenwick, and fellow supportive colleagues. Special thanks to Dr. Mike Metzler for his assistance in providing the avenue to gather my data and his patience and encouragement to complete this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table of Contents (Continued)

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

FIGURE

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

TABLE

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

TABLE

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

TABLE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are professional preparation programs in colleges for almost every professional work field within most industrial societies. Most of these programs were designed to prepare individuals to be highly qualified to meet the needs of various professional fields of work. Institutions of higher education had to set high standards of excellence, align specific goals and objectives to meet those standards, provide challenging work experiences where the students could apply their knowledge and skills, thus demonstrating their ability to fulfill the objectives of the experiences, and then graduate them into the workforce of our society. This process of preparing individuals to fulfill the needs of the ever growing, ever advancing multitude of professions in world societies was primarily left as the responsibility of colleges and universities throughout the world. This being the case, here in the United States the forefathers and foremothers embraced this opportunity and developed distinguished institutions of higher learning to fulfill these societal needs. They were very successful for many years, which is evidenced by the USA's preeminence of being unchallenged in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation. However, many American's were alarmed by the news in April 1983 when President Ronald Reagan and the National Commission on

Excellence in Education (1983) delivered their report to the American people in A Nation At Risk (1983). This report stated:

> . . . the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments. (p. 1)

The report went on to say of our nation that

> . . . we have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems, which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament. (p. 1)

As a result of their findings the report said of the nation ". . . Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, and of the high expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them" (National Commission on Excellence in Education [NCEE], 1983). The Commission defined as its objective ". . . to generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways and to renew the Nation's commitment to schools and colleges of high quality throughout the length and breadth of our land" (NCEE, 1983). Behind this commitment, the Commission acknowledged the fact that the Nation's schools and colleges had been given a multitude of "...often conflicting demands..." being "...routinely called on to provide solutions to personal, social, and political problems that the home and other institutions either will not

or cannot resolve. We must understand that these demands on our schools and colleges often exact an educational cost as well as a financial one" (NCEE, 1983). There was no wonder that the U. S. educational system continued to be "stressed" and the nation's teachers were forced to teach additional life skills that parents in their homes and community and religious organizations should have embraced and fulfilled. Take note that it was also pointed out that unification and remedy of educational problems in the United States could be achieved "only if we avoided the unproductive tendency of some to search for scapegoats among the victims, such as the beleaguered teachers" (p. 5).

The focus of efforts to reform our educational system was broad. However, studies were focusing primarily on structural and content changes in teacher education, not on the critical area of actually assessing levels of "coherence" within teacher education programs. In other words, how did all the critical "structural" parts (sequencing of courses, grades, technological resources, external assessments), function together to support sound program outcomes. One might ask, were the programs producing competent teachers? Were the programs sound in context and content? This was a big part that was missing in those early reform efforts. This is what led Howey and Zimpher (1989) to conduct their studies and also influenced the studies of Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998) in the development of their DRI Model for program assessment, and Mitchell (2000) in his development of a framework for this study of a coherency assessment protocol.

If an insignificant focus goes into an effort, insignificant results will come out. A national concern right now is that too many preservice teachers are not passing the

teacher certification tests. Possibly, and probably, had the focus in developing the programs also included the assessment of program content and function, testing outcomes could look a lot different. However, this message was given to our Nation nearly two decades ago. Within that timeframe, many Schools of Education and organizations took steps to do their part to reposition our Nation to the top. In 1992, Robert M. McClure stated that if we expected our K-12 schools to improve, then serious reform issues needed to be raised and collegially confronted in the institutions that were educating preservice teachers. In order for colleges and universities to demonstrate excellence in fulfilling their obligations towards this objective, proposals were submitted, suggestions were made, and steps were taken and continue to be taken, to constantly improve the educational programs at our colleges and universities across the Nation. Excellence in colleges, as defined in this same report, characterized colleges as "...setting high expectations and goals for all learners, then trying in every way possible to help students reach them" (A Nation At Risk, 1983).

Howey and Zimpher (1989), followed by Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998), and on to Mitchell (2000), saw that a serious gap still existed in educational reform movements. Reform efforts never seemed to address program assessment. It has addressed content and structure issues, input issues such as entry requirements, courses, grades, and external assessments like that of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) among others, but have almost completely ignored what students learned as they came through those programs. This missing link is what led to Howey and Zimpher's (1989) studies, and thus is the basis for the depth and breadth of this study.

The Coherency Assessment Protocol (CAP) is what has been developed and its objective is to help fill this gap through assessment of coherency in teacher education programs for the purpose of program improvement. The CAP takes a broad look at a teacher education program and the process students go through as they progress through a program. It assesses the coherence of the program contents, participants knowledge base of program contents and coherence across courses, faculty ownership, input, and collegiality, cooperating teachers (CT's) program knowledge, coherence of course content, (assignments, experiences, and evaluation), and student outcomes.

Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998) made another move towards this objective for program assessment. Their Development, Research, and Improvement (DRI) Model for Health and Physical Education Program Assessment (HPETE) evolved out of their work in the area of program assessment for the purpose of program improvement. They began by developing a master plan to help them set priorities, establish concise goals and objectives, comprehend contextual issues, adequately distribute resources, set up to collect data, store and examine data, make informed decisions about the program, and finally to measure the level of effectiveness of the decisions made as a result of examining the collected data. This master plan had to be embedded with theory and had to be fairly simple to implement. The DRI model "simultaneously expressed both the main processes (development and research) and the *overarching* purpose (program assessment), recognizing that process and purpose must be strongly congruent (Galluzzo & Craig, 1990; Scriven, 1981; Stufflebeam, 1982). This process-purpose foundation formed the theoretical base upon which the DRI model was built, in the tradition and

function of utilization focused [assessment]" (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000; Patton, 1978). While this instrument was developed and then utilized within a HPETE program, it is easily adaptable to other teacher education programs because it applies to teacher education programs in general, as does the (CAP).

Thus, further development and utilization of the CAP in conjunction with the DRI-Model represent far more than just a beginning to assess any teacher education program. These two assessment pieces can function together to provide ongoing formative assessment which provides quality feedback to program leaders for important informed decision making purposes, program improvement, and continued student success.

The CAP cannot claim to be all encompassing; however, if utilized with the DRI Model, it can prove to be extremely useful for making informed decisions for program modification and improvement.

Purpose of the Study

While this study is focusing on assessment for the purpose of program improvement, there are other reasons why assessment is utilized in teacher preparation programs. Galluzo and Craig (1990) summated that most assessments were conducted for four (4) typical purposes: determining accountability, determining how the major stakeholders experience a program, knowledge production, and program improvement. The specific purpose(s) of the assessments being done would dictate the selection of the most appropriate protocol(s) or instrument(s) to be used.

State Education agencies and National Accrediting Organizations that have specific criteria they are seeking would do assessments for the purpose of accountability. Assessments done to assess the level of satisfaction by the major stakeholders would serve a program by verifying the programs ability to adequately serve its students and could also identify whether the program was serving a diverse student body. Knowledge production, the third type of assessment identified by Galluzo and Craig (1990), seeks primarily to measure the knowledge base of the matriculating students in addition to looking at the pedagogical base upon which that knowledge is delivered. The fourth purpose they identify is program improvement. Whether initiated by an institutional mandate or self-imposed, seeking strategies to strengthen both the efficiency of delivery and its resulting effectiveness through student achievement measured outcomes, program improvement could be ongoing in all programs.

The protocol developed and utilized in this study actually generates some important assessment information for all four of the above-stated purposes. It assesses accountability via the review of program goals and objectives, their alignment with the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the standards of the profession, in this case the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE), and the additional alignment with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education programs, coupled with the State Professional Standards Commission, (NCATE/PSC) guidelines. These agencies mandate that specific requirements be met to fulfill their assessments. The degree to which a program meets the specific requirements partially, completely, or not at all, would be the focus of this type of assessment. As a

result of successful fulfillment of these National Agency guidelines, the purposes of which are for accountability, programs demonstrate their level of excellence. This coherency protocol also examines how the major stakeholders, students, faculty, staff, and cooperating teachers experience the program and assesses their level of knowledge about the program. Evaluating students' ability to complete the program of study and pass national assessment exams in their designated field assesses knowledge production. Galluzo and Craig (1990) suggest that this type of an assessment has the potential to generalize methods or approaches to program assessment, as opposed to making specific generalizations. Work by Zimpher and Loadman (1986) and Howey and Zimpher (1989) on which this study is based are examples of program assessment efforts that are able to make specific generalizations.

The fourth reason presented by Galluzo and Craig (1990) and the primary reason for assessing for coherency, is to inform the faculty members of the effectiveness of their program. The CAP will provide a means to measure the level of program effectiveness, inform the program of what changes need to be made, and represents a process for continuous program improvement when utilized with the RDI-Model. Regardless of what prompts this type of assessment, increasing efficiency and effectiveness of a program are the intended objective outcomes. The proposed search for coherence, seeking consistency between institutionally mandated or espoused program philosophies and the delivery of that program, fit into the fourth category of program assessment.

The objectives of this study were twofold. The first objective was to develop an assessment protocol based on the work of Howey and Zimpher (1989) who identified 14

assessment criteria to determine program coherency. Metzler (2000), Mitchell (2000), and Hampton (2002) suggest the use of their studies as a purposeful approach to assessment of teacher education programs.

The second objective was to demonstrate (test) the use of the protocol in a case study conducted on the teacher education program in the discipline of Health and Physical Education at Georgia State University (GSU). This protocol has been generically designed so that it could be utilized to assess any teacher education program without regard to the specialized field of study, although additional questions and assessment strategies can be added as needed for programs needing more discipline specific information.

Background of the Problem

As stated before, Howey and Zimpher's (1989) work was the guiding force of this study. The primary source was the chapter entitled "Toward Coherent Programs and Improved Practice" in their book Profiles of Preservice Teacher Education: Inquiry into the nature of programs. Howey and Zimpher conducted case studies at six institutions which they ". . . identified as exemplary or at least distinctive in some way." They felt that they ". . . might well find characteristics and attributes parallel to those identified in the "school effectiveness" literature" (p. 243), upon which their studies were based. The primary interest of their work was to investigate the length to which teacher preparation programs were "conceptualized and implemented and reflected attributes of a cohesive design" (p. 243). Their attempts to utilize information from those studies shed light on

many climate, structural, and organizational variables that differentiated less effective schools from more effective schools. In their study, they cite variables identified by Purkey and Smith (1983) that were also viewed positively by faculty and students alike in their case studies. These were (1) instructional leadership; (2) curriculum articulation; (3) faculty collegiality; (4) clear goals; (5) high expectations; (6) maximized time for learning; and (7) recognition of academic success"(pp. 427-52). Howey and Zimpher were also able to identify additional definable traits, yet they cautioned that their "...work was heuristic and hypothesis-setting in nature." This being the case, it was interesting to note that the findings of this study demonstrated, while the process may have been different, that the substantive outcomes show that their initial framework of attributes allowed both Mitchell (2000) and this researcher to very closely duplicate and add to their study, resulting in more extensive, but like outcomes. The protocol developed can be found in Appendix A. The results of the implementation of the CAP are explained throughout Chapters IV, V, and VI.

Statement of the Problem

In some institutions faculty members of a department in a higher education program sometimes function in a "vacuum," meaning that the "parts" of a program unit are functioning independently and the component parts (faculty, staff, and students) are not necessarily "all on the same page." A specific curriculum is approved; the faculty members teach their assigned courses, yet due to the lack of necessary faculty collegiality and unbiased communication, continuity is lacking, and all the major stakeholders lose

out and sometimes lose a quality program. There have been publications documenting experiences in teacher education programs that have shown that it was very important for communication to take place between the faculty within each pedagogic program, as well as those teaching in auxiliary support subject matter areas. It is important to work together and continuously practice open communication in all aspects of a program. This can increase the quality of a program, alleviate miscommunication, make students confident that the institution and the faculty are serious, knowledgeable, professional, and in tune with what they are doing.

Additionally, continuity and coordination of content within the framed context of an academic program are of great value, and necessity so that graduates will achieve high standards in the planned programs performance outcomes (objectives) of each teacher education program. The absence of this necessary continuity or coherence within a program can result in students not being taught the required unified content that will lay the foundation for building the content knowledge base within the context of the programs philosophical and theoretical base. What makes this critical is that graduates of each disciplinary program are required to emulate their specific discipline's body of knowledge.

One example of a problem related to this is where students were being taught their educational foundations courses by adjunct faculty members who were allowed to develop their own course outlines and content with minimal directives on content and context from the GSU Education Department. Their not being knowledgeable of both the institutions and the programs theoretical base and educational philosophy was damaging

and caused a void in what was communicated to the students. Another example was a faculty member in an education department exercising his academic freedom and choosing a text that did not quite follow the theoretical base established by the institution or department. Even academic freedom has some limitations. This ultimately misled students to utilize those theoretical views in another program faculty member's course, causing the students to be penalized for not being in alignment with the programs theoretical objectives. Though simplistic in explanation, these situations have occurred, and not necessarily in a few isolated situations. These are not desired situations for any teacher education program. Where adjunct professors are part of the faculty, they need to interact collegially with the full-time faculty and be included in departmental meetings and communiques. Departments have specific responsibilities to their adjunct faculty members to keep them abreast of the philosophical and theoretical base upon which the program is built.

One might ask, "Of what importance is a study on program coherency?" Assessing for program coherence is valuable because it can help the institution, students, and faculty build strong interconnections while also opening up a new paradigm of beliefs and ties to what is as yet unknown within the context of a more coherent program. It can inform all the stakeholders in a competent and productive manner of the effectiveness of the program, its weaknesses, and areas needing change.

Specific to this study, the HPETE program at GSU had remained the same for about 20 or so years. The program head was interested in bringing in new faculty to spearhead the reconstruction and implementation of an up-to-date, philosophically and

theoretically sound, and research based Health and Physical Education teacher education program. In so doing, Dr. M. Metzler, program chair was hired, followed by Terry Walker. Within the next two years, Dr. Bonnie Tjeerdsma-Blankenship and Dr. Debbie Shapiro joined the HPETE faculty.

Taking a serious in-depth look at each teacher education program to assess coherency can make a program extremely effective, academically attractive, and comprehensively sound, which leads to its generating desired outcomes that are both evident and measurable.

In most cases, teacher education programs were assessed by looking at various aspects of a program in isolation. Utilizing a coherency protocol for assessment allows us to look at all the component parts and then pull them together to create a comprehensive coherent program.

Buchmann and Floden (1990) identified in their study a "new" call for coherence in U.S. Teacher Education in response to growing concerns about the effects of education on student learning and equality. These and other advocates of coherence made the assumption that a carefully designed and purposely connected set of experiences were necessary to give teacher education programs sufficient strength. However, planning while wearing "horse blinders" for specific program outcomes limits a program's ability to meet varied goals and compromises the view of educational progress. Buchmann and Floden (1990) utilize the metaphor of a sparkling diamond to illustrate the fact that education "has many facets which provide light when seen from a variety of perspectives" (p. 5). This suggests that teacher education can benefit from the incorporation of

kaleidoscopic, yet planned ideas and practices, among which different patterns of connection may be drawn.

Lawson (1983) theorized that attributes of teacher education programs, which are very likely to have a desired socialization impact on potential teacher education students, point the way to situations potentially needing attention. Building upon the work of Lortie (1975), Lawson suggests, "Programs in which a shared technical culture and professional ideology have been agreed upon and made explicit will have a greater impact on recruits than programs in which this has not occurred" (p. 10). Upon reviewing literature on occupational socialization, Lawson (1986) added to his prior study to identify several issues that could impact the design of effective teacher education programs. Included in these issues were suggestions for specific educational designs in programs in which suitable knowledge and skills were blended and thoughtfully sequenced with the planning and implementation of set professional views and practices of teacher educators.

Another theoretical base informing this study comes from the research of Argyris and Schon (1974) in their work on effectiveness within the profession. Mitchell (2000) cites them, specifically stating that there are two major contributions: First, they focus on "two different theories that guide professional practice, espoused theories which identify how professionals 'describe and justify behavior' (what professionals say) (p. viii), and theories-in-use as 'operational theories of action' (what professionals do) (p. iii). The purpose of the authors distinctions between these two theories suggested that professionals were neither always consistent across theories, nor were they necessarily

aware of any inconsistencies" (p. 208). Additionally, one of the major keys to professional practice being responsible and successful is the harmonious agreement and application of these two types of theories within the teacher education program. The protocol that is suggested for use in this study identifies both what is said by the program faculty and what is done.

Argyris and Schon's (1974) second contribution to this study was their focus on the importance of looking beyond what was articulated to actual behaviors and formal documents. Their study took this one step further by differentiating between problem solving and problem setting. Within the context of this study, problem solving involves two aspects: behaviors and purposes. The first aspect of problem solving in program assessment deals with teachers researching and observing behaviors and curricular content to verify that these match program purposes. Assessors do not make any qualitative decisions with this part of the process. The second aspect deals with clarifying and analyzing what teacher educators describe as the purpose(s) of their program. Problem setting, however, requires revisiting the program purposes to determine if they are the most suitable for acquiring the desired outcomes. This aspect of program assessment is essential to professionals who are committed to confirming that their programs continue to meet the ongoing and current needs of the field, and ultimately impacting their students. The GSU HPETE Program does this as part of their ongoing program operations.

Both of these frameworks point to the importance of the development of a coherent program that is consistently delivered through all departmental faculty members,

regardless of, and in addition to, specific disciplines. What is missing from prior studies is where to find evidence of the greatly needed consistencies and coherence. Thus, this protocol has been developed to fulfill this need. Two steps were taken. First, the protocol was developed and is presented in Appendix A. Secondly, the protocol was tested in a case study which assessed the efficiency and effectiveness of the Health and Physical Education Teacher Education (HPETE) Program at Georgia State University.

Significance of the Study

In this study the focus is on looking at fourteen attributes of a quality teacher preparation program. The importance of each attribute, referred to within this study as an Indicator, contributes to the unified whole of a competent and coherent teacher education program. To demonstrate their individual significance, a discussion follows.

Indicator I sought to find evidence of whether the teacher preparation program was driven by clear conceptions of schooling and teaching. Howey and Zimpher (1989) suggest that thoughtful conceptions based upon theory, research, and practice can add to collegiality among the faculty, encourage shared beliefs, and continuous program renewal. It can enhance integration and articulation of the curriculum and influence the scope and sequence of the curriculum. It can substantially add to the socialization of and perceptual value prospective teachers embrace when becoming a teacher. Also, it can help them to understand both the necessary demands placed on teachers, and more realistic perspectives of their role as a teacher, to help their students learn. Additionally,

it can give specific direction to research and evaluation for more coherent designs of teacher education programs.

Indicator II looked at whether the faculty members were active participants in the continuously changing and evolving field of teacher education, such that they fused together offering distinctive qualities and uniqueness to their program. The important factor here was that it encouraged faculty to be more involved in ongoing research and evaluation of their program.

Indicator III focused on the simple clarity and good sense that is made of the programs specific goals. Rath and Katz (1985) emphasize in their study that programs should seek to have "just the right number" of program goals set for its students. One should note that while this is not an easy task, it should also not detract from the intellectual challenges expected of the students or from the rigor of the program. The significance of this indicator is that programs that make expectations clear to the students and in turn the students fulfill the program goals, the program will continue to attract and maintain high quality students and succeed in its continued preparation of teachers.

Indicator IV assessed whether the program was academically challenging to the point that students had to work hard to achieve the goal of becoming a competent teacher. This is important to the discipline and to the students because the program wants to produce competent, knowledgeable, and skilled teachers, while the students want to become the competent, knowledgeable and skilled teachers. It is important for professors to model professional teaching behaviors so that their students will experience first hand what is expected of them as well.

Indicator V looked at whether a program had particular themes running through all of its courses, practica, and school experiences. This was significant because the students needed first to understand and then practice consistency to determine if their pedagogical skills and training were effective. As Henrietta Barnes (1987) stated, "Program themes must be more than rhetoric . . . and will be if the program is also structured to help students develop schemata of teaching that are complete, well organized, and stable" (p. 15).

Indicator VI looked for balance and a "real" relationship between general knowledge gained from education courses that could be associated and utilized in teaching, pedagogical knowledge learned within the major, and experiences in which preservice teachers utilized both knowledge bases in practice. Harry Broudy (1980) shares that "In this field, the important empirical generalizations are very few. Education has to rely on a great variety of disciplines to provide contexts and perspectives for the human encounter we call teaching. For every item that we teach *to* the pupil, there are dozens of ideas, images, concepts, categories *with* which we teach, but do not teach *to* anybody" (p. 8). If these areas can be brought to some discernable balance, much more value can be generated through the "real" combination of knowledge gained through general education and the teaching major.

Indicator VII identified whether cohort groups existed within the teacher education program. The significance of cohort groups, as identified by the studies of Howey and Zimpher (1989) were that they strengthened teacher education programs. The identifying attributes were that they:

- Contributed to a sense of group pride and public accountability;
- High levels of group expectations appeared to have resulted in the groups accomplishments over time;
- Generated a sense of greater appreciation that was observed in relation to their stage of accomplishment;
- Appeared to have enabled group members in both a personal and an academic sense.

Indicator VIII assessed whether or not the cohort groups were confronted with specific milestones, benchmarks, or *shared ordeals*, as identified by sociologists. Specific courses and/or experiences which students knew they had to take were often met with much apprehension. However, upon completion the students expressed great pride, appreciation and satisfaction upon having achieved completing these program requirements. This satisfaction was also observed in the faculty members as well.

Indicator IX looked at whether the program allowed for an interdisciplinary or integrated approach to curriculum. Howey and Zimpher (1989) referred to this as curriculum that was organized in a certain way, usually referred to as the "block," ". . . the primary effect of which was to allow students to address, repeatedly, core teaching functions and concepts such as planning for instruction across different subject areas" (pp. 250-251). Specific to this study, assessment was focused on whether concepts were integrated from general education as well as Education core courses into the specialized area of physical education instruction.

Indicator X assessed the presence or absence of "life space." Howey and Zimpher (1989) found in their studies "...repeated instances of both faculty and students acknowledging that they had *time over a period of time* to acquire what was perceived to be significant learning" (p. 251). Programs having too much crammed into too little time found that their students' levels of retention and their proficiency of teaching skills were less than desired. Therefore, the significance of this indicator is to identify for a program whether this is an existing problem.

Indicator XI validated the existence of adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program. It is desired that these resources and laboratory components be organized so that laboratory and clinical experiences could be organized to flow continually and centrally through a program. This is important because students need to be able to apply through experience what they are learning, not just regurgitate information. The lack of adequate resources in the preservice program renders the preservice teacher inadequately prepared to successfully compete in acquiring a teaching position in the present technologically advanced school systems of today.

Indicator XII questioned the issue of whether curriculum articulations existed between activities that occurred on campus and those activities that occurred in schools. This was a critical issue because that which was learned in the college classroom must be articulated in such a way that the students can then apply those skills right away. Howey and Zimpher (1989) observed that "a common perception is that preservice students are engaged with concepts which they cannot internalize because of their lack of both more

immediate and appropriate experience in classrooms. This is related to the 'life space' problem just discussed in Indicator X" (p. 252). Too often this was not the case. They found that many programs dealt with this problem by conducting the classroom part of a pedagogy class in the morning and then taking the students that afternoon for a clinical session in the schools to experiment or practice what they had learned in class. Additionally, they observed college faculty members modeling the strategies by teaching occasionally in the schools and working with classroom teachers closely, at least, for short time periods.

Indicator XIII observed whether the programs had direct linkages with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education. This is most often found within the context of research-oriented universities. Shalock (1983) did extensive work with the methodological, practical, and political problems related to research into teacher education programs. He argued for "more coherent *program development* to occur in many instances before one could engage in a well-conceived study of benefits and costs which accompanied those model variations" (p. 253). He was basically advocating for what has now become the rule, rather than the exception in most disciplines, that of establishing "standards." He advocated further for "core 'standardized' curriculum and instructional artifacts which could contribute fuller delineation of similar programs across institutions and which in turn would facilitate replicable programmatic research and development" (p. 253). It is seen as a positive contributing factor of great importance to be one of the major contributing professionals

within the field of educational literature on research in teacher preparation programs while maintaining one's teaching responsibilities as well.

Lastly, Indicator XIV addressed the presence or absence of an ongoing plan for systematic program assessment. This inevitably should be present in any higher education program. With the multitudinous changes and technological advancement our society is faced with today, there should not be a question as to whether or not a program conducts its own regular assessments. Each program is held accountable by the institution, the State Board of Education, the National governing body for the discipline itself, as well as the mandated external assessments conducted my NCATE and the PSC. These external National/State assessments are impossible to pass without conducting and documenting ongoing systematic program assessment.

Thus, one can see how important it is that all fourteen slices of this protocol pie be unified and coherent and effectively used to generate informed decision making by utilizing it with Metzler and Tjeerdsma's RDI-Model for Program Assessment.

Research Questions

The information gathered for this study was drawn from fourteen (14) component indicators identified by Howey and Zimpher (1989) in their studies on teacher preparation program assessment as just explained. The questions are described and explained within Chapters IV, V, and VI. They are as follows:

1. Are the teacher preparation programs driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching?

2. Do the faculty appear to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles?
3. Is there a sense of reasonableness and clarity associated with the major goals of the program?
4. Is the program rigorous and academically challenging to the point that students have to work hard to achieve?
5. Do themes run throughout the curriculum like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences?
6. Is there an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge, which can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development?
7. Do student cohort groups exist?
8. At some point in the program, do the cohort groups encounter milestones, benchmarks, or shared ordeals?
9. Do the organizational and structural features of the program enable (allow for) an interdisciplinary or integrated approach to curriculum?
10. Is adequate life space found within the curriculum?
11. Are there adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program?

12. Are there numerous curriculum articulations between activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools?
13. Are there direct linkages with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education?
14. Does a plan for systematic program (assessment) exist?

These questions represent the foundation upon which many smaller instruments of assessments were developed. They are in the forms of questionnaires, evaluation charts, comparison charts, content/context charts, summary charts, and narrative explanations.

This suggested protocol was utilized in a case study to assess coherency within the Health and Physical Education Teacher Education (HPETE) program at Georgia State University (GSU). While findings will be analyzed and conclusions will be drawn, they will be based solely on the program studied. Remember, however, that the protocol is intended for use in any teacher education program.

Summary

In 1983, a substantial issue shook and awakened the foundation of our Nation. Upon this awakening the Nation rose to the call to bring our educational systems back up to the ranks of excellence, instituting "educational reform and focusing on the goal of creating a Learning Society" (A Nation at Risk, 1983, p. 6). Many advocates for this mission have taken on leadership roles in making this goal a reality. Among those ranks are the professionals in P-12 schools, colleges and universities who are committed to achieving excellence by preparing people through educational venues to develop a strong

and diverse knowledge and skill bases so that we as a Nation can respond to the challenges, not only of our society, but also of the rapidly changing global societies. This effort alone demands "coherence." This nation was warned that it was "at risk;" however, if we do not communicate and work towards common goals and objectives to meet this ever increasing and broadening challenge, we as a nation could be reawakened not at the top, but close to the bottom in the educational arena of all world societies. We dare not deny that we should meet the challenge with coherence, than suffer the ill effects of ignorance and/or apathy. This nation must continue to improve its teacher education programs, not just for the individual institutions, but for our nation as a whole.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As mentioned earlier in a national report, our Nation was awakened to a devastating realization that we were falling behind in the educational arena. As a result of this report, some early pioneers in the field of education initiated reform studies on "coherent teacher education programs" to set the stage in this area of educational reform that would continue. Several of these pioneers informed the work of Howey and Zimpher (1989), on whose work this study was based. Lawson (1983) theorized on attributes of teacher education programs that had beneficial impact on the socialization of recruits into teacher education. He suggested that "programs in which a shared, technical culture and professional ideology have been agreed upon and made explicit, will have a greater impact on recruits than programs in which this has not occurred" (p. 10). From Lawson's literature reviews in occupational socialization, his work was extended to identify several implied attributes for the effective design of teacher education programs. Suggestions from Lawson's studies were for set coordinated professional orientations of teacher educators, and a specific educational structure in the program in which field-designated knowledge bases and skills needed to be linked and progressively sequenced. In other words, he was advocating for standardization in teacher education.

Howey and Zimpher (1989) stated that "Conceptually coherent programs...(of teacher education)...enable needed and *shared* faculty leadership to engage in more generative and continuing renewal by underscoring collective roles as well as individual course responsibilities" (p. 242). Within the context of their study, they provide important context-definitive descriptions of "program" to paint a clear picture so one can understand what characteristics make a teacher education "program" coherent. The researcher believes their descriptions of both "program" and "coherence" bear repeating here:

> Programs for us represent more than the sum of ...courses and related experiences. Programs have one or more frameworks grounded in theory and research as well as practice; frameworks that explicate, justify, and build consensus around such fundamental conceptions as the *role* of the teacher, the *nature* of teaching and learning, and the *mission* of schools in this democracy. These frameworks guide not only the nature of curriculum as manifested in individual courses but, as well, questions of scope; developmental sequence; integration of discrete disciplines; and the relationships of pedagogical knowledge to learning how to teach in various laboratory, clinical, and school settings. Programs embedded in such frameworks clearly establish priorities in terms of key dispositional attitudes and behaviors enabled and monitored in repeated structured experiences. Programs reflect consideration of ethos and culture building; to the critical socialization of the prospective teacher. The nature and

> function of collegial relationships is considered both between and among faculty and students as well as with those who assume responsibilities for teacher preparation in K-12 schools. ...Programs also contribute to more mutual endeavors in research and evaluation beyond the individual course level. Various student cohort arrangements and other temporary social systems such as inquiry teams, cooperative learning structures or political action committees would be considered. Finally, programs provide considerable guidance both in terms of nature and pattern of *pre*professional or *pre*education study and also to extended experiences in schools in the nature of induction programs. ...Program approval is the primary means by which institutions are legally authorized to prepare teachers. Yet, in general, little careful thought appears to have been given to the concept of program beyond whether legally-mandated and faculty-endorsed knowledge, skills, and attitudes are embedded in a set of courses; courses reflecting a number of credit hours limited, or assumed to be limited, by regulation. We can do better than this. A major intention of our study is to provoke more attention to the nature and definition of program. ...A major interest was to examine the extent to which programs of teacher preparation are conceptualized and implemented and reflect attributes of a cohesive design. (p. 242)

Characteristics that they felt demonstrated "cohesiveness" were explained in their original research questions:

1. To what extent do the curricula reflect not only relatedness across courses and experiences in the preservice program, but also articulation with the institution's general studies/arts and sciences curricula?
2. To what extent are explicit conceptions of teaching and learning, and the mission of schooling filtered throughout the totality of the students preservice degree experience?
3. To what extent are courses and experiences provided for students structured in a developmental sequencing of more complex or extended concepts and functions viewed as central to program conceptualization?
4. To what extent does the program accommodate faculty collegiality and student cohort groups?
5. How are schools and supervising teachers selected and prepared? To what extent are their philosophies about teaching and learning and schooling consonant with that of the programs?
6. What has been the extent of change over time in the programs, and what are their sources of leadership for development and maintenance?

These are all critical components of a "coherent" program, as defined by these authors. It lays the foundation for understanding the numerous educational concerns of, not only our Nation, but other English speaking countries as well.

Other professionals in the field have similar concerns. With this in mind, it is the researcher's intent to cite the work of other individual professionals, organizations, and institutions that have conducted and/or continue to conduct research for the improvement

of teacher education. Those cited will be reflective of the program coherence context-descriptions stated above.

It is noted here that over the past five years, the literature search for this chapter has been extensive, yet the findings have been minimal. During this search, a document published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education explained a possible reason why the search has resulted in minimal studies on specific issues of "coherence." Adrianna J. Kezar (2000) reported from ERIC's Clearinghouse that:

> . . .Literature on the college curriculum has been declining since the early 1990s. In 1996, it represented fewer than 5% percent of the literature added to ERIC's database. Seldom does one hear the heated debate about general education, coherence, specialization, or moral education that characterized the 1980s. One reason for the declining emphasis on curriculum might be the attention to instruction...or that several of the curricular movements are addressed through the instructional changes. (p. 1)

Thus has been the case. However, while educational issues are being addressed as individual pieces of the whole educational pie, the bottom line is bringing all the issues back together to function as a coherent whole.

Thus, in a study conducted by McEneaney and Sheridan (1993), they assessed their Undergraduate Teacher Education Program at Indiana University, South Bend to see how it contrasted to similar programs in other institutions. The results of their study identified six (6) *factors* that appeared to be appropriate in identifying pertinent strengths

and weaknesses in teacher education programs based on prior studies related to teaching effectiveness, as were the studies of Howey and Zimpher (1989). The six (6) factors were (1) Professional skills, (2) General Professional Knowledge, (3) Specialized Professional Knowledge, (4) Humanities, (5) Educational foundations, and (6) Mathematics/Science. To cross-reference their 6-factor approach with the 14 Indicators of Howey and Zimpher's approach to assessment, factors 2, 4 and 6 would be grouped together under General Education. McEneaney and Sheridan's findings indicated that documented program changes were noticeably reflected in program graduates responses, and modifications of programs which occurred during the years of the study appeared to have resulted in more positive responses in those areas. They additionally concluded that they would continue on-going program assessment based on their collected data to become more deeply informed on why their graduates had responded as they did. Their commitment to formative assessment exemplifies the importance they place on having a coherent program by conducting continued program improvement assessments, and making program changes based on *informed* decision making.

As recent as 1998, Hickok (1998) revealed in his report, the quest for *Higher standards for teacher training,* that based on his belief shared by most educators, "it is the skill and dedication of the teacher that creates a place of learning. So, it is both distressing and heartening that incompetence among the ranks of the nation's teachers was finally entering the spotlight" (p. 6). He cited one case in which the state education department of New York had discovered that hundreds of its teachers, most

having earned master degrees, were unable to pass a standard test in math, reasoning skills, and English.

In another case, the state of Massachusetts repealed their decision to reduce the qualifying score on a basic teacher-licensing exam upon discovering that 59% of the applicants failed it. In the state of Pennsylvania, several discoveries were startling. In 1996 they detected a system with minimal evidence of competence and quality. They identified six areas of concern: admission standards were low for incoming candidates for teacher education, grading standards were extremely low, it was confirmed by the National Center for Education Statistics that grade inflation was much more pronounced in the nation's education departments than in other fields. Additionally, they found that many teacher education programs were increasing departmental requirements for education courses instead of strong preparation in academic subjects. Students in high school teacher preparation were not required to take the same courses as their peers majoring in academic subjects like science or history. Some of the foreign language teacher candidates were not able to engage in basic conversations in the languages that they were supposedly trained to teach. School system administrators discovered that there were not enough benchmarks to assess the progress of aspiring teachers and that many teacher preparation programs had no set "standards for achievement" in the academic content areas in which they were certifying people to teach. Were these programs utilizing such protocol as the Coherency Assessment Protocol (CAP) suggested in this study, and/or the Research, Development, Improvement Model developed by Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998), these issues could possibly have been avoided.

However, to address these pressing issues, Governor Tom Ridge decided to counter teacher incompetence with a strong program that focused on rigorous standards that were both measurable and clear. Standards were set encompassing everything from higher admissions standards to candidacy for the education department, curricular requirements like those in other academic areas, to required early classroom experiences at the very beginning of their training. As a result of that program, Teachers for the 21st Century Initiative evolved. Pennsylvania teachers were expected to become the most qualified in the nation.

This was a promising move on the part of the governor, yet if we look at what over 40 states are doing to meet the high demand for more teachers, that of initiating six-week training programs for teachers, efforts like those of Governor Ridge would be beneficial only to students completing those programs. However, it also makes four or five year college programs less attractive to many candidates who will choose the "shorter and easier" route to becoming a teacher through those alternative programs approved and funded by the state. This was an issue examined by the American Federation of Teachers and discussed in their report (American Federation of Teachers, 2000).

In 2000, the American Federation of Teachers reported that their research findings "demonstrate that teacher quality is the single most important school variable affecting student achievement" (p. 1). The continued high demand for new teachers due to the ever increasing student population to be served, in addition to the increased demand for high quality in the teacher workforce have placed teacher preparation programs in the twenty-first century spotlight. Despite many hindering factors, including the ever-changing state

requirements, most education faculties at colleges and universities throughout the nation have graduated thousands of knowledgeable and highly capable teachers.

While these many issues and problems have been surfacing, many solutions been suggested to resolve them. They point out that one area of current "reform" is undermining and very possibly "weakening the professional schools that educate teachers through the deregulation or elimination of teacher training" (p. 1). They report that advocates for these alternative programs are seeking federal funds to be provided for training in any program wanting to train teachers, not just schools of education, but K-12 schools, private corporations and non-profit groups in on-the-job training type situations. These programs are in place and are operational today. How effective these programs are in developing a high-quality teacher workforce is yet to be assessed.

On the other side of the coin, in a fairly recent report of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Daniel Gursky (2001) cites from AFT's K-16 teacher education task force report, Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction, that it does not seek to eliminate the traditional approach to the preparation of teachers as some schools of education have chosen to do. Instead, it seeks to establish a better bond between schools of education and the districts they serve. They make a clear connection between training and teacher supply and demand:

> In our view, the best way to bring an adequate supply of well-trained teachers into the classroom is not by avoiding collegiate teacher education, but rather by strengthening it—by bringing more professional control,

higher quality, greater resources, and much more coherence to the way higher education screens and prepares teacher candidates today. (p. 2)

In a report written by Jennifer O'Day, Margaret E. Goertz, and Robert E. Floden, in the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (1995), an organization whose mission is to strengthen American students' educational performance by providing both beneficial and sound information, state as one of their three main goals "to conduct research that will lead to more coherence of state and local policies that promote student learning" (p. 2). This too is evidence that "coherence" both within and beyond teacher education programs is considered to be an absolute necessity for continued improvement of student learning. It should additionally confirm whether the "alternative" programs are achieving increased student learning or merely one goal. That one goal would be putting a minimally prepared teacher in front of the classroom due to the "pernicious notion that teachers are mere "facilitators" of leaming-that once trained as teachers "in general," they have the ability to teach any subject" (Council for Basic Education, 1986, p. 38), possibly even an "out-of-field" teacher; another problem eminently still facing our schools today.

In a review and analysis of recent research, Russell and McPherson (2001) discussed, among other pressing issues about teacher education, this impact of out-of-field teaching on student learning. Ingersoll (1997) cited statistics from 24% to 54% for out-of-field placements, while some studies suggested even higher numbers when assessing the numbers for inner-city high schools and hard-to-staff schools. What is shocking in these numbers is that it equates to mean that "several million students a year are being taught English, history, and mathematics by teachers without even a university

minor in the subject they are teaching" (Ingersoll, 1998, p. 12). The bottom line is that out-of-field teaching significantly downgrades the quality of instruction. To address this issue, experts turn again to coherence. One of the two suggestions made by Russell and McPherson was to "create high quality programs of preservice teacher preparation, supported strongly by coherent strategies of professional development (including mentoring and induction) in the early years of teaching. The other was to "address the issues that lead to dramatically high rates of teacher turnover, particularly among beginners, thereby reducing or eliminating the need for out-of-field placements" (p. 13).

In its 90th Anniversary issue May 8,1998, Indiana University School of Education published the "Six guiding principles" which were developed by the Teacher Education Steering Committed which was formulated to restructure the teacher education programs in 1995. Through collaborations with others, inside and outside of the school, they established six principles, which were used as a standard in redesigning the teacher education programs at the Bloomington campus. One of those six principles focuses on coherence:

> Community Reflection: Effective teacher preparation requires that participants develop a sense of community to bring coherence to programs, foster an appreciation of the power of cooperative effort and encourage a dialogue that promotes the continual rejuvenation of teacher education. (p. 2)

This concept of "coherence" must be operational, not just espoused. It stands to reason that cohesiveness is necessitated both outside and inside of teacher preparation programs.

This relates to the importance of including all of the stakeholders of the teacher education programs. It must not be forgotten that the students in the surrounding community schools will be the major beneficiaries of the teacher education programs as well by its producing competent, knowledgeable, professional teachers who can and will relate well with the other faculty members, students, parents, and communities in which they serve.

Another area impacting coherence in teacher education programs is the fact that all institutions of Higher Education are required to meet the standards of external assessments by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The U.S. Department of Education recognizes it as the professional accrediting body for schools, departments and colleges of education. Within the documentation presented by each institution, there must be a section entitled "conceptual framework." Within this statement, each institution proclaims its conceptual description. In randomly searching for other teacher education programs, which focus on coherence, Harding University's (2002) conceptual framework was found. In it, they state that "this document articulates the vision, mission, beliefs and program objectives for the Teacher Education Program and ...provides a coherence among curriculum, field experiences, assessment, and evaluation of the program" (p. 1). This articulates the importance of coherence in teacher education programs and the bigger picture is painted in greater detail throughout the other chapters of this document.

The School of Education at the University of Northern Colorado states in its program description:

> Teacher candidates are assured of coherence in the Professional Teacher Education Program as courses are designed in a sequence that allows them to build knowledge from the theoretical to the practical. In addition, students will experience rich and challenging work in partner schools so that the coherence is enhanced by a well-planned series of opportunities to work with children in schools. (p. 1)

In the accreditation report for the University of Maine, NCATE recommended for the College to

> establish a formal, comprehensive plan for evaluating programs for revision and improvement; establish performance criteria and greater coherence between the developing academic program and core instructional principles; and to strengthen coordination between education programs in art and music with the College's academic principles and operational procedures. (p. 2)

Here it is seen that coherence is no longer just desired, but mandated by the national accrediting agency.

Even outside of the U.S., educational systems are seeking more coherence. In an article by Gaby Weiner (1999) of Umea University in Sweden, she reports that "Sweden has also produced proposals for restructuring initial teacher education to encourage greater coherence between different routes and educational levels" (p. 2). Diarmuid Leonard and Jim Gleeson (1999) of the University of Limerick, Ireland wrote on Context and coherence in initial teacher education in Ireland: the place of reflective inquiry. Of

interest to them was a major issue arising in relation to the coherence of teacher education with its broader context, because the educational system in Ireland has been functioning under the Registration Council regulations established over 80 years ago, under the Intermediate Education Act of 1914 (p. 50). This act stated that:

> Secondary school teachers must satisfy the Registration Council regulations...for registration as teachers and they may, on appointment, teach any subject on the school curriculum. Remarkably, there have never been any requirements of professional training for those university graduates who are qualified to teach general education subjects in the non-secondary sector. By contrast, teachers of specialist subjects (such as Home Economics, Metalwork, etc.) must hold recognized teaching qualifications. (p. 51)

To this extent, reform is past due.

In other institutions, University of Malta, Southeast Missouri State University, the University of North Carolina, and many more, are all seeking to build coherence within the teacher education programs.

Summary

With the level of interest in developing program coherence, it is believed that the use of this protocol and that of Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998) would surely lead institutions towards more coherent teacher education programs. To date, no other protocol's have been developed that would assess program coherence. Thus, it is hoped

that the CAP will break ground and lay the foundation for additional research and development in this area.

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

When the federal government entered into social programming about thirty years ago, program evaluation, as a formal type of inquiry, began. At the time, evaluators had a small knowledge base for producing timely information related to complex social problems. Thus, evaluators resorted to borrowing procedures and methodologies from the disciplines of social science. Regression equations were developed by economists to explain the effects of programs while educational researchers looked at social programs and compared individuals with others on selected program indicators (Gredler, 1996).

These early methodologies were not met with satisfaction. This stirred on discussions, analyses of the roles of evaluation in the contexts of politics, revisions of some methodologies, and further development and research of methodologies yet to be used. Important to mention here is that their focus was on "outcomes," only later expanding their interest to studying the contexts and implementation of programs. From these aggressive early beginnings, the focus moved to include working with several groups of stakeholders addressing problems of performing evaluations within a political context. Perceptions of the role of evaluation have expanded beyond the meager goal of informing the primary decision-makers to include a variety of interested groups and the evaluation community at large.

To provide clarity of understanding about the focus of this study, the researcher chose to make a connection rather than a distinction between definitions of evaluation and assessment because in many studies they are somewhat synonymous, while in others they are miles apart in purpose. Thus the following explanations show more clearly how evaluation is synonymous to assessment within the context of which it is used in this study.

According to Krathwohl (1998):

> Evaluation mainly tells you the study was designed to answer an applied question regarding value or worth—the effectiveness or worth of some kind of treatment, how well units, persons, or programs are working, comparing programs against one another or against some standard (for example, a 95% graduation rate)...evaluation...may use any design or method, and cover any subject matter or content. (p. 29)

This is a very clear description, although not all-inclusive, of assessment as it is utilized in this study of coherency assessment in teacher education programs.

Bogdan and Biklen (1998), in their discussions about forms of action research, describe evaluation within the context of policy research, as "...research done to describe and assess a particular program of change they oversee in order to improve or eliminate it. Evaluation research is the best-known form of applied research. The product of such research is usually a written report" (p. 211) (Guba, 1978; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Patton, 1980, 1987; Fetterman, 1984, 1987). While this assessment protocol is not designed to

eliminate programs, it does provide extensive information to improve programs and a written report is easily produced upon completion of the assessment.

Gredler (1996) points out that there are three areas that are often confused with program evaluation. They are educational research, accountability, accreditation/self-study reviews, each having their own distinguishing purpose. This study provides a protocol that can enhance and lend assistance to these other forms of evaluation, however, it is primarily focused and utilized "in-house" for program improvement as opposed to being used as a form of external assessment.

Educational research, like program evaluation, is a form of disciplined inquiry for the purpose of developing knowledge. However, as Gredler (1996) points out, there are four differing factors between the two. In educational research "(1) the major purpose is to test principles or theories that may be generalizable across space and time... (2) the researcher determines the nature of the problems to be investigated... (3) methods and procedures are implemented so that individual values or preferences do not influence the outcome... and (4) the primary audience for the research is often other researchers and theorists in a particular area of inquiry... indicating that educational research is primarily discipline oriented" (p. 14). In this study, assessment is utilized in the process of educational research and is closely synonymous to educational research in purpose because it seeks to provide information in all four of the areas described above. This protocol will provide valuable program decision-making information to any teacher education program that utilizes it in conjunction with discipline specific assessment instruments to complement the outcomes.

Gredler (1996) states that the purpose of assessments for accountability is that "accountability systems typically are designed to assign responsibility for outcomes among a program's operators (Cronbach & associates, 1980, p. 17), thus making it both a measure of control and a very restricted view of the reasons for program success or failure" (p. 15). While this study does assessment and provides information that will point to areas of faculty responsibility within the program, its purpose is to inform program personnel so that adjustments and improvements can be made as deemed necessary.

Assessment for the purpose of accreditation and self-study reviews primarily includes document reviews to identify whether all the specified documents are available and if specific documents meet the guidelines for their content and are easily accessible. It also looks at programs in totality for State and National document criteria. It also determines whether or not all of the physical and financial resources are available to the programs. This study, however, does review documents for content, but goes far beyond the boundaries of specific guidelines to assessing if the program content is not just espoused, but real. Thus, it ties together each of these aspects of educational research and accountability with that of assessment/evaluation. It also provides qualitative data for accreditation and self-study reviews.

The initial purpose of this study was to look towards further developing an alternative and effective protocol for the purpose of conducting formative teacher education program assessment. In 1997 this researcher learned about the faculty members in the Health and Physical Education Teacher Education (HPETE) program at

Georgia State University (GSU) who were conducting such a study on their program. The researcher was invited to join this effort, and it was suggested that the Howey and Zimpher (1989) study be used as a theoretical base to test its ability to effectively assess the levels of coherence in its program, thus the pursuit turned into a case study. In 1998, Murray Mitchell began to develop an instrument based on the work of Howey and Zimpher. This study grew out of Mitchell's because the program chair desired a more extensive look at the program's measured effectiveness in providing a comprehensive and 'coherent' teacher education program to its students. One may ask why this particular study, meaning why is the work of Howey and Zimpher being used as the guide for a protocol development? One answer is that they made note in their study that "there remains a need, just as there is in terms of research and development, to institute more comprehensive and formalized schemes of evaluation that critically examine key aspects of *programs* of teacher preparation. They also are the only researchers who suggested a workable framework to assess coherency. Additional answers to this question are multifaceted and lie within the descriptions of why they developed their 1989 study.

Like this study, the focus of the Howey and Zimpher's (1989) study was on teacher education program improvement. Most of their research was centered on school effectiveness studies. Having conducted case studies of six prominent university teacher education programs, in the final chapter of their book, Profiles of Preservice Teacher Education, they centralized their focus on three major goals. The first goal was to develop further the concept of a *program* of teacher education by utilizing observations made in their cross-institutional case studies. They identified what they saw to be

"attributes or characteristics—beyond what occurs at the individual course level—that contributed in positive ways to the education of beginning teachers. In this way, they differentiated between *program* and *curriculum*" (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 241). Secondly, they gave recommendations to improve preservice or initial teacher preparation. Lastly, they suggested that additional research into programs of teacher education were needed. Thus, this study was conducted and the findings have been compiled.

Presentation and Definition of Variables

To build a proper foundation for understanding what is being discussed here, a set of definitions are needed. Because this study is based on the work of Howey and Zimpher (1989), the author found it important to define terms as they are stated in Howey and Zimpher's original study. In it, they basically explain the 14 areas investigated in this study. As such, their explanation follows:

> Programs may 'have one or more frameworks grounded in theory and research as well as practice; frameworks that explicate, justify, and build consensus around such fundamental conceptions as the *role* of the teacher, the *nature* of teaching and learning, and the *mission* of schools in this democracy.' These frameworks guide not only the nature of curriculum as manifested in individual courses, but, as well, questions of scope; developmental sequence; integration of discrete disciplines; and the relationships of pedagogical knowledge to learning how to teach in various

> laboratory, clinical and school settings. Programs embedded in such frameworks clearly establish priorities in terms of key dispositional attitudes and behaviors enabled and monitored in repeated structured experiences. Programs reflect consideration of ethos and culture building; to the critical socialization of the prospective teacher. The nature and function of collegial relationships is considered both between and among faculty and students as well as with those who assume responsibilities for teacher preparation in K-12 schools" (Now elementary schools are P-12). Conceptually coherent programs enable needed and shared faculty leadership to engage in more generative and continuing renewal by underscoring collective roles as well as individual course responsibilities. Programs also contribute to more mutual endeavors in research and evaluation beyond the individual course level. Various student cohort arrangements and other temporary social systems such as inquiry teams, cooperative learning structures, or political action committees would be considered. Finally, programs provide considerable guidance both in terms of the nature and pattern of *pre*professional or *pre*education study and also to extended experiences in schools in the nature of induction programs. (p. 242) (Used with permission of the authors)

These condensed statements simplistically identify what is looked at in the 14 Indicators of Coherence. While each area is explained in detail later in this study, here the *perimeters* are somewhat defined.

Institutions are given legal authority to prepare teachers via program approval. In the past, these comprehensive and meticulous assessments, in general, did not lend much thought to the concept of *program* beyond whether or not it was legally approved and was supported by faculty-endorsed knowledge, skills, and attitudes that were embedded in a set of courses. These courses earned an institutionally/nationally-mandated number of credit hours; in some cases assumed to be mandated, by regulation. Howey and Zimpher asserted that the profession could do better than this and stated that one of the major intentions of their study was to "provoke more attention to the nature and definition of program" (p. 242). To that end they developed the fourteen indicators or attributes of a coherent program. They concurred that the fourteen indicators they suggested "described those conditions and practices that appeared to contribute at the least to coherent programs of teacher preparation" (p. 246).

To clarify what is meant by coherency, Webster's dictionary (1993 ed.) defines it as "(1) the quality or state of cohering: as (a) systematic or methodical connectedness or interrelatedness, especially when governed by logical principles: consistency, congruity (b) integration of social and cultural elements based on a consistent pattern of values and a congruous set of ideological principles. (2) obs: mutual understanding: fellow feeling. In relation to this study, coherency of programs could be metaphorically understood by envisioning a spider web. All of the web strands represent the various aspects that make up a coherent program. The final product, the complex interconnectedness of one continuous strand, (all the aspects of program, curriculum, faculty, students, etc), designed for specific purpose(s), (delivery and reception of an academically coherent

program), culminate in a masterpiece designed for several purposes, primarily the development of competent new teachers.

Various terms that are utilized in this study are defined in alphabetical order for ease in locating them. Many terms used are common to the field of education, and those not completely understood here will be further explained within the context of their use later in this document.

Other proponents of coherence in teacher education have published their professional work. Two of them are Margret Buchmann and Robert E. Floden (1990). Their paper, *Program Coherence in Teacher Education: A View From the United States*, discusses common concerns. They also point out that advocates for coherence in the U.S. assumed that many interwoven experiences were necessary to empower teacher education programs. They sought to interconnect the public schools and the universities in ways that would allow for more worthwhile pupil learning. Additionally, they questioned how teacher education could be reformed to lessen the gaps in schooling that reflect divisions in society. This was also an observation of Howey and Zimpher (1989) in their studies where they found that many students in some universities were both uninterested in working with under-served urban youth and avoided the issues when brought up in discussions. At the time of their writing, they saw that the pool of preservice minority teachers was not keeping up with the number in demand. Suggestions were given to increase this number and to accommodate them with forms of financial assistance for their training and mentoring them through the educational phase and on into at least the first year of teaching. Maintaining connections with program graduates is an important

aspect of building and maintaining coherence in teacher education programs beyond the matriculation period because they can provide important feedback to the program for improvement purposes. The discussion now will move to defining terms and variables in alphabetical order.

Variables

Block classes: The "block" consists of the curriculum and instruction methods courses: KH 4510, 4520, 4530, and 4540. These course titles/descriptions can be found in Appendix B.

Clarity: Raths and Katz (1985) emphasize that a program should be "just the right size" in terms of the number of major goals set forth for students, primarily in the area of dispositional behaviors. These should be clear and understandable.

Cohort groups: A group of students sharing the same experiences throughout their matriculation in a college program. In the GSU HPETE program, these groups start to form during the KH 3200 course, but are more identifiable during the 'block' and on into student teaching.

Cooperating Teachers (CT's): Full-time health and physical education teachers employed in the public schools that have been trained and are compensated for their participation in providing on-the-job-training to health and physical education student teachers from the university. They have specific guidelines to follow as stated in Appendix C.

Curriculum: Primarily referring to courses, laboratory, and field experiences coordinated with study occurring mainly in university classrooms.

Curriculum articulation: The important critical connections between what is taught in the classroom of the university and what occurs when teaching in the schools.

Experience designed to promote pedagogical knowledge: Experiences students participate in to develop their teaching skills. Generally, these are initiated in clinical courses and methods courses. At GSU this would take place in KH 3200 and the "block" courses.

GSU: Georgia State University

General Knowledge: Knowledge gained in courses taught in the General Education Core of a college. These are primarily courses not having specific connections to the subject matter of a program major.

HPETE: Health and Physical Education Teacher Education

Leadership (Strong): Necessary component for schools/programs to be effective.

Lifespace: Refers to adequate time over a period of time for assimilating needed knowledge/skills and abilities. Looks at whether a program crams needed knowledge into short or extended periods of training. Norm Sprinthall and Lois Theis-Sprinthall (1983), emphasize the need for what they term *extended* periods of action and reflection. This is accomplished in many programs through early immersion of students into school classrooms.

Pedagogical knowledge: Instructional knowledge in methods of teaching gained in the major subject area.

PETEAP: **P**hysical **E**ducation **T**eacher **E**ducation **A**ssessment **P**roject.

Program: An expanded view of the actual courses, labs and field experiences related to study that takes place in the college classroom. They encompass one of several frameworks embedding research, theory and practice, frameworks that clarify, justify, and lay the groundwork for consensus around basic conceptions.

Reasonableness: A program includes enough content coverage/student requirements. It is not overfilled with so much content that it prohibits a high level of intellectual development and quality content retention.

Rigorous (academically challenging) programs: Students should have to work hard and smart to achieve a high level of knowledge and skill in their teaching field. Expectations should be made clear and should also be justified, or possibly negotiated with the adult students.

Scope: Broadness of subject matter coverage.

Sequence: Order in which university major programs suggest courses be taken. Within this set of courses, there should exist a broadening and deepening of subject matter studied, not just mere presentation, repetition, and regurgitation of information.

Students: Persons enrolled full-time or part-time in the health and physical education major program at the university.

Supervising Teacher: Full-time faculty members from the university in the health and physical major program who have the responsibility of visiting the schools in

which they have student teachers to observe, give feedback, and advise, in conjunction with the cooperating teachers in the school(s). They give the student teachers their final grades at the institution.

Themes: Program concepts and theories are interwoven throughout the curriculum. For example, a theme in the HPETE program at GSU is the use of different teaching models that students utilize in each of their methods courses.

University Faculty: Full-time faculty members teaching in the health and physical education major program. Also, other university faculty members from specified departments.

The fourteen indicators of coherence discussed in this study each inform practice by assessing whether that aspect of the teacher education program is functioning at a high level of competency and effectiveness and is producing the desired outcomes. The following charts include explanations that explain how assessing each indicator informs practice (Figure 1).

Assessing coherency in teacher education programs is an important information-producing task which when used with the Development, Research, and Improvement Model (DRI-Model)(Metzler and Tjeerdsma, 1998) can produce the kind of information that will inform the faculty of any teacher education program of its strengths and weaknesses. The Coherency Assessment Protocol (CAP) is completed and utilized within the research stage of the DRI-Model. The information is drawn from the development stage, assessed in the research phase, and then the desired changes are implemented within the decision-making and improvement stage. While the CAP could

Indicator		How It Informs Practice
1. Are the teacher preparation programs driven by clear conceptions of schooling/ teaching?	↔	Faculty, cooperating teachers, and students all need to have common philosophies of schooling/teaching so that their teaching practices will reflect their beliefs and theoretical base.
2. Do the faculty appear to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles.	↔	The faculty members need to reflect their beliefs and philosophies when modeling teaching so that the students learn teaching theories and the application of teaching methodologies.
3. Is there a sense of reasonableness and clarity associated with the major goals of the program?	↔	The students need to understand the program in which they are enrolled, the major goals, and how they can most effectively achieve program goals.
4. Is the program rigorous and academically challenging to the point that students have to work hard to achieve?	↔	There should be distinct levels of academic performance expected of teacher education students. Challenging work will prepare them for teaching and build up the necessary self-confidence they will need in the classroom.
5. Do themes run throughout the programs curriculum like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences?	↔	It is critical that students are able to tie concepts from one major course to those in another. Interrelatedness is important to help students tie theories and methodologies together in their teaching.

Figure 1. How Indicators of Coherence Inform Practice

Figure 1 (continued)

Indicator		How It Informs Practice
6. Is there an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge, which can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development?	↔	Students should be able to relate knowledge from the general and pedagogical areas of study and utilize them in their teaching of concepts and skills to their students.
7. Do student cohort groups exist?	↔	Research has proven that the use of cohort groups in teacher education programs are very effective in building collegiality, confidence and a strong sense of accomplishment.
8. At some point in the program, do the cohort groups encounter milestones, benchmarks, or shared ordeals?	↔	This aspect of the cohort experience is important because the students experience these difficult tasks and periods together and then share their experiences through discussions in classes.
9. Do the organizational and structural features of the program enable (allow for) an interdisciplinary or integrated approach to curriculum?	↔	It is important for students to be able to integrate knowledge from different sources across their curriculum. Application of multiple knowledge bases is critical to concept building.
10. Is adequate life space found within the curriculum?	↔	Students need to have time for planning and implementation of those plans within the timeframe of their program courses. Realistic expectations should reflect that expected of teachers in their professional practice.

Figure 1 (continued)

Indicator		How It Informs Practice
11. Are there adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program?	↔	Students must work with the equipment, curriculum materials, and instructional resources with which they will be expected to teach. They should also have experience with information and communication technologies so that they can utilize them in their teaching practices. The laboratories should be equipped with the proper up-to-date equipment so that the new teachers will be knowledgeable, experienced and able to perform assessments on their students.
12. Are there numerous curriculum articulations between activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools?	↔	Students must have numerous opportunities to practice what they learn in the classroom with actual students. Application of knowledge through actual experiences teaching in the classroom is the best way to assess whether learned methodologies are effective.
13. Are there direct linkages with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education?	↔	It is important and useful for the faculty to make the students aware of the sources teaching theories they are utilizing in their studies and involve them in their research related to teaching.
14. Does a plan for systematic program assessment exist?	↔	Programs that conduct ongoing assessments of their effectiveness in preparing new teachers and then utilize their findings to improve the program will continue to produce knowledgeable, teachers who will have a competitive edge in finding attractive teaching positions.

function alone, it functions much more effectively within the context of the DRI-Model when utilized for the purpose of program improvement. This is because the development stage informs the CAP. The CAP is completed as part of the research stage, and then action is taken in the decision-making and improvement stage of the DRI-Model based on the information generated from the CAP and other assessment instruments, to follow-up and implement the desired changes deemed necessary.

Summary

It is the intent of this protocol to generate fundamental, yet extremely important information for program leaders to assist them in making program improvements and also make them aware of their ongoing strengths. It gives all the stakeholders in a program a greater sense of cohesiveness and interconnectedness of the program components. Each of the faculty members should be well informed of the total program being offered within their discipline. Without this aspect, unidentified gaps can and will be present within a program and this can also be reflected in the level of student knowledge regarding their program of study, as well as their level of confidence in the program.

Limitations of the Study

This study was based on a theoretical framework suggested by experts in the field of teacher education. It in no way represents an all-inclusive look at teacher education programs, however it does provide a lengthy and comprehensive look at teacher education programs. The study goes a step further by also providing a suggested protocol for assessing coherency in teacher education programs for use by others in the teacher

education field. This protocol can be enhanced with the additional incorporation of the Development, Research, and Improvement Model for Physical Education Teacher Education Program Assessment (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 1998). The design of this assessment instrument as well makes it versatile and usable by any teacher education program.

The researcher's background is represented by 22 years of teaching in Health, Physical Education, and Dance in Higher Education teacher preparation programs, and 3 years of teaching in K-12 schools, bringing 25 years of experience to this project.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

All higher education programs have general sets of goals and objectives that were established by the institution of which they are a part, as well as by professional field related organizations that establish specific program criteria, along with State and National Accrediting Agencies. As a result of the 1983 publication of A Nation At Risk, many higher education institutions, in conjunction with the professional field organizations, made reform movements to establish "standards" by which programs would be guided in order to produce more effective and qualified teachers. Standards were developed in Health and Physical Education Teacher Education Programs by the National Association of Sports and Physical Education (NASPE) in conjunction with "various and extensive national efforts to set standards and policy frameworks which effect the quality of teacher preparation and continuing professional development" (NASPE 1995). Examples are The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989, and The National Council on Educational Standards and Testing, 1992. These standards were developed based on the *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue (1992, 1994)* document. It is the work of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), a collaboration among key stakeholders in teacher education facilitated by the

Council of Chief State School Officers, which is relevant to the preparation of teachers in all subject matter areas. It represents modern educational thought and provides an excellent example of a vision statement developed to guide practice. It is coordinated with and parallel to the expectations of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Professional Standards Commission (PSC), cooperatively.

To go a step further towards assuring that a program does what it sets out to do, this writer suggests, along with prior educator/researchers, such as Howey and Zimpher (1989), Mitchell (2000) and Metzler and Tjeerdsma (2000), that assessing a program from a "coherency" standpoint to determine if a program is structurally coherent is cognitively and professionally beneficial for assessment purposes. This means looking at how the program is put together from a broad perspective, and not minimizing observations to solely focusing on performance outcomes. It is important for all the stakeholders in the program to see and understand what the "final" picture is supposed to look like. Thus, the design and nature of this study is qualitative due to the multitude of program features that have been assessed. As it is stated by Krathwohl (1998), "The qualitative researcher is concerned with how individuals perceive their world and sees reality as an interpretation of these perceptions constructed by each individual." He goes on to further emphasize that "the explanation ...grows out of the perceptions of the subjects...because it makes the point that social phenomena, in this case perceptions as well as ontological program factors, can be examined by a variety of methods" (p.23). In checking for "coherency," we are seeking to find out if the epistemology, (*the*

constructed reality) of the stakeholders agrees with the ontology (*what is real in the program).* Further, does it meet both the qualifications of the axiology (what is of great value to the stakeholders) (Piantanida & Garman, 1999, p. 60), and the requirements of the accrediting agencies in its process of fulfilling the goals and objectives of the HPETE program, or any teacher education program. The institution which is made up of administrators, faculty and staff, serving students, who in turn are interacting and teaching in the schools where they work with cooperating teachers and younger students, are all stakeholders. While the young children were not interviewed for input into this study, they are the final recipients of the "quality output" from this HPETE program. The research methods used include interviews, observations, and reviews of institutional documents, inventory checks, and facility visits.

Design of the Study

As stated before, the design of this study is Qualitative. To define this context, Miles and Huberman (1994), reference B. L. Berg (1989) state that "...all data are qualitative; they refer to essences of people, objects, and situations." People have a "basic" experience, which is then changed into words ("His skin is moist." ..."Her temper flared."), or numbers ("Three people agreed, eight did not."). Miles and Huberman (1994) focus their attention on "data in the form of words—that is, language in the form of extended text...The words are based on *observation, interviews, or documents...* " or as termed by Wolcott (1992), "watching, asking, or examining," with the data collection activities typically being carried out in close proximity to a local

setting for a sustained period of time" (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The data, when collected, are in unfinished form needing to be corrected, interpreted, edited, and typed; while tape recordings need to be transcribed and corrected (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 9). All of these methods of data collection were utilized in this study.

Miles and Huberman (1994) discuss that an "important feature of well-collected qualitative data is that they focus on *naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings,* so that the researcher and readers have a strong handle on what 'real life' is like" (p. 10). They further elaborate that confidence is made stronger by *"local groundedness,* the fact that the data was collected in close proximity to a specific situation, rather than through the mail or over the phone" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). For this reason this researcher was invited to and utilized a local State University.

This study utilizes fourteen Indicators of Program Coherence. It provides a more comprehensive view for an "across the board" assessment of a Teacher Education Program. The institution, faculty, staff, students, cooperating teachers and their students, (all the major stakeholders), institutional curriculum, syllabi, and other documents, will each be observed utilizing the 14 Indicators of Howey and Zimpher (1989). A model (instrument) has been developed from these 14 Indicators by Murray Mitchell, and expanded by the writer, which has been used to measure program "coherence," and can be used to measure the same in any higher education teacher education program. (This instrument or "assessment model" is explained further in Chapter V.)

In this particular study, it is assessing a Physical Education Teacher Education (HPETE) program. Because of the type of information and methods of data collection,

this study qualifies as a qualitative study. Interviews, observations, document reviews, and facility visits are all methodologies used to gather information for qualitative studies.

Setting: Population and Program

This section will describe the setting, subjects, and the program being studied, along with the methods of data collection and the procedures for data analysis. The comprehensiveness of this study dictated by the numerous program component aspects being observed (14 Indicators), required six types of subjects, several data sources and collection methods, and the use of data triangulation analysis procedures to assist with the explanation and interpretation of the data collected.

The setting of this case study is in a large urban research university located in downtown Atlanta. It houses six colleges and an "educational philosophy of combining teaching, research and service into one learning experience. Because of its 'real-world' programs, problem-solving research and strong community outreach, Georgia State is rapidly becoming a first-choice university."

Sample

Data were generated from six groups of subjects: (1) students taking the first methods course in the Health and Physical Education Teacher Education (HPETE) curriculum (KH 3200), (2) students in the last few weeks of their student teaching experiences KH-4660 (HPETE), (3) cooperating teachers (CTs) from student teaching placement sites, (4) HPETE faculty at Georgia State University (GSU), (5) faculty

teaching core classes in the Division of General Education, and (6) staff from the HPETE department. There was a diverse, yet unique perspective generated from each group.

The questions asked of each group were specifically based on the information needed to address each of the 14 Indicators. Due to the fact that the questions generated by Mitchell (2000) and the originators of the Indicators, Howey and Zimpher (1989), the writer utilized the same questions for validation purposes and added a few more for specific clarity related to this case study. The rubric located in Appendix A was used to assess the level of coherency for each Indicator. This researcher further developed the rubric and it was approved by the advisory committee members.

The identity of the subjects participating in this study has been kept confidential, except where identity was necessitated and approved by said individuals.

Student Subjects

In spring of 2000, five students from the KH-3200 course, Instructional Skills for Health and Physical Education, which is the first methods course students take in the major, volunteered to participate in an oral interview and answered the questions specified in the student questionnaire located in Appendix A. Of these five students, three were male and two were female.

There were also five Student Teacher's enrolled in KH-4660, Student Teaching in Health and Physical Education P-12, who volunteered to participate and answered the student questionnaire in an interview as well. The questions asked of each group were

kept the same to determine if their opinions about the program were any different based on their different levels of experience in the program.

Cooperating Teachers (CT's)

Cooperating teachers (CT's) are teachers employed full-time by a local school district. They have participated in training and are responsible for the direction and supervision of the "on-the-job" training, so to speak, of preservice student teachers. These individuals are paid for their work with the student teachers. Detailed responsibilities of the CT for the HPETE program at GSU can be found in Appendix C.

In this study, two CT's participated in the interviews, each having served in that capacity prior to and throughout the time of the implementation of the NASPE Standards, (goals and objectives of the revised HPETE program). They each had served as cooperating teachers with GSU HPETE student teachers nine (9) or more years. They were both Atlanta Public Schools Elementary Physical Education teachers.

HPETE Faculty

There were five full-time HPETE faculty members interviewed. Mike Metzler, Professor, and Terry Walker, Assistant Professor, worked together to develop the current program which was developed based on the NASPE Standards. It was implemented in the academic year 1994-95. In 1996, Bonnie Tjeerdsma-Blankenship was hired into the program with expertise in the area of qualitative research methods for teacher education. This enhanced and facilitated the program's ability to expand on their Assessment Project already in progress. There was also a Health Education Specialist, Sandra Owens,

Instructor, in the program that participated in the interview process. Debbie Shapiro, Adapted Physical Education Specialist and Assistant Professor, was new to the program in her first year of teaching at GSU.

General Education Core Faculty

Faculty members in this department teach a basic core of general education subject courses that are required of all GSU students seeking a baccalaureate degree. Some of the subjects that are taught by these faculty members are Economics, Humanities, Math, English, and other related courses (GSU Undergraduate Catalog, 2000, p. 158).

Due to the fact that little direct communication regarding course content and major program content integration, between General Education Faculty and specific program faculty takes place, only one faculty member, with the rank of Associate Professor, currently the Program Chair, was interviewed.

HPETE Staff

One GSU Department staff member was interviewed because only one was assigned to the HPETE program.

HPETE Program

Based on the Undergraduate Catalog for the calendar years 2000-2001, the HPETE program consisted of a minimum of 120 semester hours. This was broken down into 8 component Areas: A-E of the Undergraduate Core Curriculum, F - Preparing for

the Major, G – Major Teaching Field, H – Practicum and Student Teaching (GSU Undergraduate Catalog, 2000)

Core areas A through E, consisting of the Undergraduate Core Curriculum, can be found in Appendix D.

Area F: Preparation for a Major (18)

Courses in Area F, which constitute the remaining 18 semester hours in the core curriculum, may be found in the college listings section of degree requirements. These listings should also be consulted to see if there are any courses recommended from among the offerings in areas A to E. Students seeking a B.A. in English with a secondary English concentration or a B.S. in mathematics and secondary school teaching will be required to take an additional nine semester hours of introductory education courses above the general requirement of 18 semester hours.

Bachelor of Science in Education

- Major in Health and Physical Education
- Department of Kinesiology and Health
- The Program Theme: The Educator as Critical and Divergent Thinker

The Health and Physical Education program prepares graduates to teach integrated programs of health and physical education for grades prekindergarten through 12. Areas of emphasis include skill development and analysis, personal health assessment, pedagogical-disciplinary study, contemporary curriculum, instructional skills and models, and direct field experiences. The program features a field-based approach (GSU, 2000).

Program of Study

The student must complete Areas A-E of the Undergraduate Core Curriculum (see Appendix D). A grade of C or higher is required in all courses listed below. Semester hours are shown in parentheses following an entry.

Area F. Preparation for a Major

Required (18):

EPSF 2010	Introduction to Educational Issues (3)
EPY 2050	Human Growth and Development (3)
EXC 2010	Exceptional Children and Youth (3)
KH 2130	Introduction to the Allied Fields of Health, Physical Education and Fitness (3)
KH 2220	Musculoskeletal Function and Human Performance I (3)
KH 2230	Musculoskeletal Function and Human Performance II (3)

Area G: Major Teaching Field

The student must apply for teacher education prior to beginning course work in Area G of his or her program. To be accepted into teacher education, the student must have a 2.75 cumulative grade point average on all undergraduate course work previously completed; he or she must have passed the three sections of the Praxis I Assessment or presented official scores to demonstrate exemption; and he or she must participate in an interview with program faculty.

Content: Required (29)

KH 3000 Introduction to Health Education (3)

KH 3010 Performance & Analysis Area I: Movement & Rhythms (2)

KH 3020 Performance and Analysis Area II: Training and Fitness (2)

KH 3030 Performance and Analysis Area III: Team Sports (2)

KH 3040 Performance and Analysis Area IV: Lifetime Sports (2)

KH 3050 Performance and Analysis Area V: Outdoor and Adventure Activities (2)

KH 3550 Evaluation and Instrumentation In Physical Education (3)

KH 3600 Biomechanics

KH 3610 Motor Learning and Development

KH 3650 Physiology of Exercise

KH 4700 (TE) Capstone Seminar (0)

Nutr 3100 Nutrition and Health (3)

Methods and Curriculum: Required (16):

KH 3200 Instructional Skills for Health and Physical Education, P-12

KH 4510 (TE) Curriculum and Instruction For Pre-K and Elementary Physical Education

KH 4520 (TE) Curriculum and Instruction for Secondary Physical Education

KH 4530 Curriculum and Instruction for Health Education

KH 4540 (TE) Curriculum and Instruction for Adaptive and Inclusive Physical Education

Area H: Practicum and Student Teaching (15)

First Aid and CPR Proficiency: all students must have current certifications in First Aid and CPR (including infant, child, and adult) at the time of application to student teaching. Those certifications must remain current through the end of the student teaching term. Students may demonstrate this proficiency by attending the appropriate certifications from the American Red Cross or by completing **KH 3390** Advanced First Aid and Emergency Care.

Tort Liability Requirement: all students must show proof of Tort Liability Insurance prior to enrollment in KH 3660 and at the time of application for student teaching (KH 4660). Students may obtain the appropriate forms from departmental advisers.

Required (15):	**KH 3660**	(TE) Practicum in Health and Physical Education (2)
	KH 4650	(TE) Opening School Experience (1)
	KH 4660	(TE) Student Teaching in Health and Physical Education P-12

Total Program: minimum of 120 semester hours (GSU, 2000)

Data Collection

The study began by reading and reviewing the text written by Howey and Zimpher (1989), *Profiles of Preservice Teacher Education.* Next, a literature search was conducted to determine if other studies had been done and published which focused on

"coherency" in teacher education programs. Having found that minimal studies had been published during the initial literature review, the focus was set on looking at the research-in-progress which was being conducted by Mitchell (2000) as part of the "Physical Education Teacher Education Assessment Project" (HPETEAP) being conducted at Georgia State University. The scope of his study was not as broad as this thesis. Mitchell's (2000) research provided the basis and framework for this study to be conducted, however more extensive data collection was needed and conducted for this dissertation study. The steps taken were as follows:

1. Review the 14 Indicators
2. Develop a "Data Acquisition Table"
3. Review literature for like studies looking at "coherency" in teacher education programs.
4. Review the questions developed by Howey and Zimpher (1989) and Mitchell (2000). Add questions where needed.
5. Develop separate questionnaires for each group of subjects: KH-3200 and KH-4660 students, HPETE Faculty, staff, Cooperating teachers, General Education Faculty.
6. Have questionnaire's reviewed by advisors.
7. Schedule and audiotape interviews with subjects from each designated group.
8. Transcribe interview tapes.
9. Collect documents needed from the institution:
    - Major course syllabi

- General Education course syllabi (sample)
- GSU HPETE Planned Program
- University Catalog
- School of Education (SOE) Goals and Objectives
- SOE Conceptual Framework
- HPETE infusion of the SOE Conceptual Framework
- HPE Goals and Objectives (NASPE Standards adopted as the knowledge base and programmatic goals for HPETE at GSU) (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 2000)
- Rosters of major courses in the TE program for three or more quarters/ semesters
- List of curriculum materials
- List of instructional resources (equipment, facilities, faculty access, media, technology, etc)
- Identification of Cooperating Teacher's to contact
- Program's plan for systematic program assessment

10. Formulation of "Major Course Comprehensiveness, Continuity, and Consistency" Chart
11. Formulation of "Syllabi Review Results" Chart
12. Development of "Teaching Consistencies Across Faculty" Chart

Description of Steps

Steps 1-2: The fourteen (14) Indicators were taken from both Howey and Zimpher's study; however, the revised format was taken from Mitchell's (2000) study. Each Indicator was analyzed to determine what information needed to be gathered and how the information would be obtained.

Step 3: Next, a literature review was conducted. Initially, only a few studies had been published and accessible on Teacher Education and Assessment of Coherency. However, within the past two years, more studies have been conducted and the findings have been published. As a result, the literature now reflects a resounding appeal for and use of assessing for coherency, not only in the educational arena, but also in business and industrial circles as well. The information for this section is in expanded form in Chapter II on the Literature Search.

Steps 4-5: Questions that needed to be asked in the various interviews were established as the next step. Each Indicator necessitated specific information so the questions were developed and set on paper in order so that they would be identifiable by Indicator. Questions were set on the appropriate questionnaire based on which group of interviewees was to be asked the questions. Both Howey and Zimpher (1989) and Mitchell's (2000) questions were utilized, in addition to the few this researcher added for clarity.

Step 6: Questionnaires were given to the Advisory Committee Members for review and comment before they were utilized in interviews with the research subjects.

Steps 7-8: Upon approval of the questionnaires, appointments were made with the prospective research subjects. Before each interview was conducted, approval was requested for the interview to be audiotaped. Upon approval, the interview was conducted and recorded. Following the interviews, the tapes were transcribed right away by the researcher to avoid any possible misunderstandings when transcribing the interviews.

Step 9: Documents were requested and provided by the HPETE program faculty. Documents collected included major course syllabi, General Education course syllabi (sample), University Catalog, HPETE Planned Program, Copy of Mitchell's study, copy of McCullick's (2000) study, random sample of course records, Application for Admission to Teacher Education at GSU, HPETE Program Assessment articles from Program Chair, School of Education (SOE) Goals and Objectives, SOE Conceptual Framework, NASPE Standards, (Knowledge base for HPETE program), curriculum materials available to students, a list of instructional resources (equipment, facilities, faculty access, media, technology), names and numbers of cooperating teachers to contact, and the HPETE program plan for systematic program assessment.

Step 10: The formulation of the **Major Course Comprehensiveness, Continuity, and Consistency Chart** was for the purpose of analyzing whether the course syllabi provided all the information suggested in the Indicators being studied. Each course syllabus was reviewed to validate or nullify the findings. The chart and a full explanation of the findings can be found in Chapter V.

Step 11: The **Syllabi Review Results Chart** identifies the course name and number, each course objective, the coordinated learning activities to teach the objective, the coordinated course assignments, the evaluation criteria for that objective, and the final analysis as to whether the component parts "match" or accomplish their intended goal(s).

Step12: The **Teaching Consistencies Across Faculty Chart** looks at each major course in the HPETE planned program. The credit hours, person(s) responsible for preparing the course syllabi, the name of the primary Instructor, identification of any "other" Instructor(s), and the identification of "differences" in the course(s) when taught by one of the "other" Instructors are all areas analyzed for the designated Indicator(s).

Data Collection Procedure

The first step in this process to assess what is needed for each Indicator was to read through the text of the studies done by Howey and Zimpher (1989). This led to the inquiry with Mitchell who was in the process of testing the "Coherency Model" on the HPETE program at Georgia State University as part of the "Assessment Project" being

done by Physical Education Teacher Education program. Having been permitted to sit in on one of the faculty interviews and upon the completion and publication of Mitchell's (2000) study, additional questions were developed.

To validate the use of these 14 Indicators, each has been referenced to the original text of Howey and Zimpher (1989), as well as to Mitchell's (2000) study. The fourteen (14) Indicators were analyzed and broken down one-by-one to determine what information sources needed to be tapped to provide the needed information to assess the presence or absence of coherence in each.

Instrumentation

Physical Education Teacher Education: Coherency Assessment (Self-Assessment) Protocol and Rubric

The program coherency self-assessment process involves four phases identified by Murray Mitchell (2000): (1) Explicitly identifying program goals; (2) examining the structure and sequence of curricular experiences for the potential to contribute or detract from the established goals; (3) exploring the actual conduct of curricular experiences beyond formal descriptions; and (4) identifying and comparing the outcomes of curricular experiences with the program goals. Additionally, one should utilize these findings to improve/revise their program as deemed necessary, as suggested in the overall Assessment Project (2000) created and designed by Dr. Michael Metzler and Dr. Bonnie Tjeerdsma of Georgia State University. Metzler and Tjeerdsma's (1998) Development, Research, and Improvement Model for Physical Education Teacher Education

Assessment gives a "completion touch" to the assessment, while it allows for an ongoing cycle of program assessment and improvement. Ultimately, any program would find this system to be extremely beneficial since it would allow a program to remain current in its program offerings, while also fulfilling the needs of children and school systems being served, when the university programs are able to produce the highly skilled teachers desperately needed in school systems today. Additional insights have been acquired as a result of this study that will be summarized in the case study data analysis in a Chapter V.

First, a table listing the 14 Indicators of Program Coherency, Howey and Zimpher, (1989) is given. Following this table will be a breakdown of the Assessment Rubric designed to explain the findings of this case study. While this case study has been conducted on a teacher education program in the discipline of Health and Physical Education, this researcher hopes that the instrument itself can be utilized in any Teacher Education program, given the necessary adjustments when referring to specific criteria. A full sample Assessment tool that can be utilized by any teacher education program is included in Appendix A. A list of the 14 Indicators of Program Coherence is presented in Table 1.

Continuing with the design already put in place by Murray, this study has identified each indicator, described the evidence utilized to assess the presence or absence of coherency, and the benchmarks/rubric designed to determine the level of coherency found, if any. This study was done on the Physical Education Teacher Education Program at Georgia State University.

Table 1

Indicators of Program Coherence

14 Indicators of Program Coherence
I. Programs of teacher preparation are driven by clear conceptions of Schooling/teaching (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 246.
II. Faculty appears to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 246.
III. A sense of reasonableness and clarity are associated with the major goals of the program (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).
IV. The program is rigorous and academically challenging, and students have to work hard to achieve (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).
V. Themes run throughout the curriculum, like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 248).
VI. There is an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge that can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development (Howey & Zimpher,1989, p 248).
VII. Student cohort groups exist (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 249).
VIII. At some point in the program, cohorts encounter a milestone or benchmark or shared ordeal (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 250).

Table 1 (continued)

14 Indicators of Program Coherence
IX. Organizational and structural features of the programs enable an Interdisciplinary or integrative approach to curriculum (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 250).
X. Adequate life space is found within the curriculum (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).
XI. There are adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, and information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).
XII. There are numerous curriculum articulations between the activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 252).
XIII. There is some direct linkage with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 253).
XIV. A plan for systematic program (assessment) exists (Howey & Zimpher, 1989).

Following is a breakdown of the data collected for each Indicator, the source of the data, and justification for its inclusion. The measurement rubric has been placed in Appendix A for reference.

I. **Programs of teacher preparation are driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 246).

Howey and Zimpher (1989) offer for consideration that conceptualizations achieved through research, theory, and practice can significantly inform and enhance the conceptualizations delivered by faculty members and acquired by the students related to teaching, various aspects of curriculum development and implementation, and views of what is expected of prospective teachers. Additionally, they could acquire more realistic definitions of the role of a teacher, and more specificity in a "coherent design for programmatic research and evaluation" (p. 246). Thus this Indicator addressed faculty perceptions about teaching and schooling, course syllabi reflections of schooling and teaching, as well as students being able to identify the same.

Mitchell addressed that across the faculty in a program, beliefs should be consistent about the specific discipline, teachers, and the purposes of schools. Both the course syllabi and the faculty should reflect consistencies in programmatic beliefs, and students should be able to identify this consistency in beliefs regarding the specific discipline, teachers and the purposes of schools.

Evidence to address this indicator was collected by interviewing program faculty members, cooperating teachers, and students from both the beginning of the program cycle (KH3200) and the end (KH4660) of the program cycle. Additionally course syllabi were reviewed to identify the purpose, objectives, learning experiences, course assignments, and evaluation criteria of major courses to see if they reflected any clear consistent conceptions related to schooling and teaching.

Evidence

1.1 Beliefs about the purposes of schools, teachers and the discipline of physical education are consistent across faculty members.

1.2 Course instructors and/or syllabi reflect expectations consistent with the beliefs expressed by faculty.

1.3 Students are able to identify beliefs consistent with faculty and syllabi regarding key purposes of schools, teachers and the discipline.

1.4 Staff members in the department have similarly consistent beliefs with the faculty about the purpose and function of schools and the importance of Physical Education in the schools at levels P-12.

1.5 A review of all the major-program syllabi to determine if the objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and evaluation criteria "match-up" to meet the intended objectives.

1.6 Cooperating teachers for the department have similarly consistent beliefs about the purpose and function of schools and the importance of Physical Education in the schools at levels P-12.

Information Sources

1.1 In formal and informal interviews with the five (5) major faculty members, the following questions were asked:

(a) What do you see as the main purposes of schools?

(b) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

(c) What do you consider to be the main function(s) of schools?

(d) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to students?

(e) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in schools at the elementary level?

(f) At the middle school level?

(g) At the high school level?

(h) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated?

1.2 Instructors/syllabi reflect expectations consistent with beliefs expressed by faculty. The approach chosen to facilitate the collection of data follows: Collect course syllabi for each of the courses in the program indicated by the answers to the questions above. If the documents are comprehensive, search for the extent to which purposes and/or functions are explicitly addressed in the formal course objectives, in the outline of learning experiences, in the description of course assignments, and/or in the strategies for assessment of student performance. Interview course instructors to gather insight into each of the areas described above.

1.3 In formal and informal interviews with five **faculty members**, five **student teachers**, five **early program students,** the following questions were asked:

(a) What do you see as the main purposes of schools?

(b) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

(c) What do you consider to be the main function(s) of schools?

(d) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to students?

(e) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in schools at the elementary level?

(f) At the middle school level?

(g) At the high school level?

(h) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is are communicated?

Students only

(i) Look over the charts in front of you. For those courses that you have taken, are there any differences in what is indicted and your actual experience(s) in the course(s)? If yes, please explain.

1.4 In formal and informal interviews with the **one** staff member, the following questions were asked:

(a) What do you see as the main purpose(s) of schools?

(b) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

(c) What do you consider to be the main functions(s) of schools?

(d) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to the students?

(e) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in the schools at the elementary level?

(f) At the middle school level?

(g) At the high school level?

(h) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to the students?

(i) What resource materials/equipment/teaching resources, etc., are available for student use?

1.5 Major program course syllabi were reviewed and interviews were conducted with major program faculty to determine if the objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria "match-up" to meet the intended objectives.

1.6 In formal and informal interviews with the two (2) **cooperating teachers**, each having been working with the program prior to and throughout the program revisions, (at least the past 8 years), the following questions were asked:

(a) What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in schools?

(b) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in schools at the elementary level?

(c) At the middle school level?

(d) At the high school level?

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for each Indicator is located in Appendix A. Each Indicator and subcategory is based on a 5-point rubric. Each was assessed on a scale of

1 to 5 with 5 being a high indication of coherency and 1 being the least. Each of the 14 indicators was assessed separately because (1) each Indicator assessed something different and (2) the cut-off number of respondents was different.

> **II: Faculty appears to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 246).

Howey and Zimpher point out that it is important for faculty members to identify with the whole faculty as well as the *program* faculty. Taking ownership of the *program* most often reflects more collegiality and regular input on both a formal and informal basis. In their studies they found that there was more of a *shared* agenda for instruction and added that they also shared a "sense of joint ownership in and responsibility for the total program" (p. 246). They suggest that this shared responsibility could encourage a deeper concern for research into and evaluation of their program(s). This type of evaluation and inquiry is very comprehensive and necessitates inquiry collaboration back in the late 80's too seldom found in teacher education.

Mitchell (2000) reiterates Howey and Zimpher's (1989) finding that faculty should gravitate towards a specific identity as a program, have a sense of ownership for it with a vested interest in courses being taught in definitive ways, and it should be evident that there is efficacy in the purpose behind efforts of faculty with additional evidence that there is progression towards purpose achievement; by course, in the graduates, and the program overall.

To assess this Indicator, audiotaped/transcribed interviews with program faculty were conducted extensively to identify which approaches the different faculty members took towards teaching and maintaining "ownership" in the planned program. Additionally, all of the major course syllabi were reviewed to see if they identified any specific teaching strategies, methodologies, or techniques that could be readily evident.

Evidence

2.1 The faculty members talk about themselves as having a specific identity as a program (i.e., beyond merely being members of the college or larger department).

2.2.1 There is a sense of ownership of the program, however, courses do not belong to individual faculty members, per se; rather, all faculty have a vested interest in courses being taught in particular ways, and the faculty control what courses are taught, how, and when.

2.3 There is evidence of efficacy, for there is a sense of purpose behind faculty efforts and a sense that progress is being made toward achieving that purpose; for individual courses, for the students who graduate from the program, and for the program overall.

Information Sources

2.1 In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following questions:

(a) Are there different groups of faculty within this department who have shared interests (in a particular focus area in Physical Education)? If yes, can you identify the group(s) and how their interests might differ from other group(s)?

(b) Who is primarily responsible for the design and delivery of the teacher preparation program?

(c) Who decides when and how revisions might be required in the teacher preparation program?

2.2 (a) What are the main courses in the (physical education) program curriculum?

(b) Who is responsible for preparing course outlines/syllabi/ teaching the courses? Has more than one faculty member ever taught specific courses? If yes, does the course differ dramatically from one faculty member to another? If yes, in what ways do they differ?

2.3 (a) Do you feel your input is sought and valued regarding how this program is designed and delivered?

(b) Do you feel that graduates from this program now are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago? If yes, why. If no, why?

(c) If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from this program being his or her teacher next year?

In formal and informal interviews with Cooperating Teachers, ask the following questions:

(a) How many years have you acted in the capacity of a cooperating teacher?

(b) How many years with Georgia State University (GSU)?

(c) (If more than 5 years) Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago? If yes, why?

(d) If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from Georgia State University's HPE program being his or her teacher next year?

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

III. A sense of reasonableness and clarity are associated with the major goals of the program (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).

Mitchell states that specific goals, which have been set and written for a program, must be available to anyone desiring their review. These goals should be known and accepted by faculty and students within the program and informed external evaluators who may review the program. Consistency should be evident between course syllabi and program goals (i.e., specific goals described by the faculty members should appear in course syllabi, in the way of objectives, lecture topics, assignments, evaluative measures, and other pertinent aspects contained in course delivery and assessment procedures).

Program major area documents were reviewed and faculty/student interview results were summarized. Faculty members and students were both asked if they could identify any of the major goals and objectives of the major program, and then were asked to elaborate on any they could recall without utilizing a paper document to recall the goals and objectives. Raths and Katz (1985), emphasize what they call their "Goldilocks theory," aiming for "just the right size" (p. 47) referring to how many clearly specified major goals are set for students, which are primarily in the form of dispositional behaviors. Howey and Zimpher (1989) found this to have some validity in terms of the

programs they visited when conducting their original studies seeking coherence. Howey and Strom (1986) went further in suggesting that programs develop a "selection process which hinges on a series of diagnostic simulations, written inventories, and clinical observations early on in a program, that are *explicitly* and directly related to a limited number of dispositions, in this instance desired human qualities of a teacher" (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247). Students would not be in question as to what the program expectations are if this measurement aspect is in place.

Evidence

3.1 There is an explicit written set of major goals for the program and these goals are available to all who wish to read them.

3.2 The major goals are known and make sense to faculty and students within the program and they also inform external auditors who may review the program.

3.3 There is evidence of consistency between program goals and course syllabi (i.e., prominent goals described by faculty appear in course objectives, are obviously linked to topics of lecture and discussion in the course outline, and can be tied to specific assignments—research papers, midterm and final exams, etc.).

Information Sources

3.1 Ask each faculty member if they can produce a written copy of the major goals of the program.

3.2 After reviewing the formal written major goals of the program, consider the following Questions:

(a) Do these goals make sense to you or are they filled with empty rhetoric?

(b) Ask each faculty member to identify one or two of the major goals (i.e., from memory rather than as read from a document), then choose one or two goals and ask where in the program the goals are addressed.

3.3 Gather course syllabi for major courses and look for links to the major goals. In formal and informal interviews with cooperating teachers, ask if they are familiar with the major goals and objectives of the HPE program at GSU? Do they make sense to you or are they just senseless rhetoric?

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

IV. The program is rigorous and academically challenging, and students have to work hard to achieve (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).

In the area of admissions to institutions, too often institutions think first to raise the entry standards to get *desired* students into their programs, yet these criteria have limited predictive validity in assessing the success rate of a prospective student in acquiring and/or developing necessary qualities of a teacher. However, this does not talk to the academic difficulty of the programs the *institution* is offering, which is an important aspect students desire to know about. In Howey and Zimpher's (1989) studies, they found that many students admitted their perceptions were that there was at least as much difficulty in the professional education curriculum as was found in their general studies courses. Thus, it is important to note that it is just as important to clearly identify

a high quality program as it is to inform students of the considerable commitment of time and energy necessary to complete the program.

Mitchell (2000) suggests that formal publication should be made of all program standards, entry, retention, and exit requirements. Course records should reflect that not all students receive recurring top grades in all courses, and the grading policy should reward varied levels of competence in student work. Finally, students should be able to identify any part or parts of the program that are notably academically challenging.

In assessing this Indicator, a review was conducted of the program major area documents, institutional documents for academic entry, retention and exit from program, and program guidelines. Interviews were also conducted with students and faculty who were asked if they could identify any particularly difficult or challenging aspects of the program that made students have to work harder to achieve the goals of the courses. They were asked to elaborate on the challenging aspects, be it intellectual or time demanding of the program, and tell why they felt they were so, if any were identified.

Evidence

4.1 There are formal standards and procedures for entry into, continuation in, and graduation from the program that are higher than the absolute minimum for the institution.

4.2 Program standards are formally published and enforced.

4.3 When course records are reviewed, there is evidence that not all students receive top grades in all courses, based on a grading policy that differentially rewards different levels of competence in student work.

4.4 Students within the program are able to identify aspects of the program that are particularly academically challenging.

Information Sources

4.1 Consult institutional documents to identify the following:

(a) Minimum grade point average from high school and/or standardized test score required for entry into the institution.

(b) Minimum grade point average required for entry into the teacher preparation program.

(c) Minimum grade point average to remain academically eligible to continue toward a degree.

(d) Minimum grade point average to remain academically eligible to continue toward teacher certification.

(e) Minimum grade point average for graduation, as mandated by the institution.

(f) Minimum grade point average for graduation within the teaching option.

4.2 Obtain a copy of the program guidelines for entry, continuing eligibility, and graduation from the department .

4.3 Obtain a copy of course grades for several courses within the major (student identity concealed for privacy). Match grades received with the relevant course syllabus where requirements for course grades are described.

4.4 In formal and informal interviews with students about to student teach and those who have finished student teaching to:

(a) describe one or more parts of the teacher preparation program that challenged them.

(b) explain how the aspects of courses described where challenging.

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

V: Themes run throughout the curriculum, like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 248).

Mitchell expects that faculty should be able to identify primary concepts that are planned for presentation at various levels across the curriculum. Syllabi should reflect the repeat attention to these primary concepts at different levels across the curriculum. Students should be able to verify syllabi content and the presence or absence of concepts across the curriculum. CT's supervising student practica should be able to identify primary concepts students should have mastered by the time they arrive to their school and be able to reinforce those concepts that they are expected to reinforce.

In assessing this Indicator, interviews with faculty, students, and CT's were conducted and the information was used to see if each group could identify themes that reoccurred throughout the program. This included course material, practicum materials, observations, and individual research. Major area course syllabi were also reviewed to see if these themes were present.

Henrietta Barnes (1987) speaks with concrete experience about the attributes and materialization of themes. "Themes in a program...must be more than rhetoric. They are effective only if...it is also structured to develop schemata of teaching that are complete, well-organized, and stable" (p. 15).

Margaret Cohen (1985) cites another example of utilizing "achievement-motivation" (p. 40) as a primary theme and demonstrated how it was consistently materialized in prospective teacher's behavior throughout their teacher education program matriculation.

Evidence

5.1 Faculty can identify key concepts that are intentionally addressed at different levels across the curriculum.

5.2 Syllabi reflect important topics that receive attention in more than one course at different levels of emphasis (i.e., introduction, comparison or contrast with other topics, detailed or in-depth study). The attention could take the form of one or more of the following: Readings, lecture topics, project assignments, term paper topics, practica, and the like.

5.3 Students confirm contents of syllabi and the different concentrations on topics across courses.

5.4 Cooperating teachers who supervise student practica are able to identify key concepts that students should have mastered before they arrive at the school.

5.5 Cooperating teachers who supervise student practica are able to identify key concepts that they are expected to reinforce for student teachers that arrive at their school.

5.6 In formal and informal interviews with the cooperating teachers, ask the following: Have the supervising teachers communicated with you:

(a) to discover what is taught?

(b) to discuss types of experiences and expectations?

(c) to describe what their student's need from their student teaching experiences?

(d) to obtain feedback from you as to whether they need to make program modifications to improve the performance of their students.

Information Sources

5.1 Referring back to Indicator #3, each faculty member was asked to identify one or two of the major goals (i.e., from memory rather than as read from a document), and then asked to choose one or two goals to find out where in the program the goals were addressed. Here it needs to be identified how treatment of the major goals might be different in different courses within the program, if goals are identified as being addressed in different courses. For example:

(a) Faculty identified that "Goal 1" is addressed in different courses in the program. How might this treatment be different in "course a" (early in the program) from treatment in "course b" (later in the program)?

5.2 Request copies of course syllabi for major courses within the program; if syllabi are incomplete, use formal or informal interviews to inquire of most recent instructors regarding documentation of types of assignments and purposes of assignments.

5.3 In formal or informal interviews with students, confirm that assignments in the course syllabi were actually assigned and graded.

5.4 In formal or informal interviews with two or more cooperating teachers routinely involved with the preparation program, ask what kinds of knowledge and skills do you find their student teachers have mastered?

5.5 In formal or informal interviews with two or more cooperating teachers routinely involved with the preparation program, ask what kinds of knowledge and skills are you expected to reinforce with student teachers?

5.6 In formal or informal interviews with two or more cooperating teachers routinely involved with the preparation program, ask have the Supervising Teachers communicated with you to:

(a) Discover what is taught?

(b) Discuss types of experiences and expectations?

(c) Describe what their student's need from their student teaching experiences?

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

VI. There is an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge that can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical

knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 248).

Faculty and student interviews were conducted to identify if the course content materials and information being shared and the in-class peer teaching methodologies were parallel to and in agreement with the practices that were taking place out in the field. Harry Broudy's (1980) point can be made here:

> There is an important difference, however, between the intellectual base for the teaching profession and for the prospective engineer, physician, agricultural expert, or lawyer. These professions have their theory base in generalizations derived from empirical science or highly codified bodies of principles and precedents that are accepted by the members of the guild. This is not the case in education. In this field, the important empirical generalizations are very few. Education has to rely on a great variety of disciplines to provide contests and perspectives for the human encounter we call teaching. For every item that we teach *to* the pupil, there are dozens of ideas, images, concepts, categories *with* which we tech but do not teach to everybody. (p. 8)

Thus, narrower conceptions of technique or method need to be kept in proper perspective, particularly in elementary education programs, of which Health and Physical Education encompasses.

Mitchell (2000) indicates that faculty should be able to describe the relationships they expect are present between different types of knowledge (pedagogical, experimental,

general) and identify program attempts to show or demonstrate those relationships between each type of knowledge. Students should be able to identify how certain knowledge gained in one part of the program, say Math, is recalled and applied elsewhere in the program, possibly a methods course on the integration of knowledge across disciplines. Additionally, Mitchell (2000) states that syllabi from major methods courses should also identify this knowledge integration.

To assess this Indicator, course syllabi were reviewed to see if they reflected how the pedagogical theories were being applied throughout the courses. Additionally, Cooperating Teachers (CT's) were asked if specific themes were evident from the work of the students under their supervision.

Evidence (Evidence for this indicator is essentially subjective)

6.1 Faculty should be able to describe expected relationships among each of several different types of knowledge (general, pedagogical, experiential) and identify program attempts to recognize, reinforce and integrate this knowledge through relationships among each type of knowledge.

6.2 Students should be able to describe different experiences in their program and be able to describe how what has been learned in one part of the program has received additional attention elsewhere in the program (especially from a general topic like psychology to a specific pedagogical application like a methods or student teaching experience).

6.3 Syllabi (especially course outlines for courses like senior seminars, curriculum, and methods of teaching) should reflect attention to integrating different types of knowledge from different parts of the pre-service preparation from within and beyond the program?

Information Sources

6.1 In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following questions:

(a) Can you identify anything that students learn in any general required course (i.e. history, psychology, math, etc.) that is somehow reinforced in a methods course and/ or in a practicum experience?

(b) Have you ever communicated with general education instructors who typically teach courses that teacher preparation students take to discover what is taught or to describe what your students need from those courses? If so, what if any modifications have been made to any courses?

(c) Have you ever communicated with cooperating teachers who typically supervise students in practicum experiences to discover what is taught, types of experiences and expectations, or to describe what your students need from those experiences? If so, what if any modifications have been made to any courses or experiences.

6.2 In formal or informal interviews with students, ask the following question:

Can you identify anything that you have learned in any general education required course (i.e., history, psychology, math, etc.) that is somehow reinforced in a methods course and/or in a practicum experience?

6.3 Collect and examine course syllabi (if they are complete) to identify course objectives, lecture or lab topics related to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within and/or beyond the program. If syllabi are incomplete, interview faculty responsible for selected major courses, asking them to identify course objectives, lecture topics, or laboratory experiences related to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within and/or beyond the program.

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

VII: Student cohort groups exist (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 249).

Mitchell identifies that groups of students should be discernible across semesters and years. The faculty should be able to identify selected courses as a "junior" or "senior" course. Also, students should be able to identify other students who have been subsequently enrolled in the same courses and shared experiences as they have matriculated through the planned program.

Thus, faculty interviews were conducted to see if each of the faculty members could identify if a cohort group or groups existed in the program. The students were interviewed to determine whether or not they were aware of any "groups" that could be considered "cohort" groups within the program. The Planned Program documents were also reviewed to see if any groups were identified. Howey and Zimpher (1989) point out that in their studies, the use of cohort groups was viewed as a "strength" of a program.

Numerous benefits accompanied this concept. They experienced and demonstrated pride, a sense of public accountability, specific levels of accomplishment, respect for the "next step" in their programs, and they sustained high levels of expectations for one another. They summated that the cohort groups appeared to enable one another in the academic sense, and also in a more personal and psychological sense, as well (p. 249 H & Z). Additionally, they found that the faculty identified that they had also benefitted from their interactions with the cohort groups.

Evidence

7.1 Groups of students should be identifiable in any given major courses across quarters, semesters, and years.

7.2 Faculty should be able to describe selected major courses as a "junior course," a "senior course," and so forth.

7.3 Students should be able to identify other students with whom they have shared experiences as they have progressed together through the program.

Information Sources

7.1 Collect student rosters for major courses in the teacher preparation program for three or more semesters/quarters. Determine the extent to which the same names appear on courses sequenced across time.

7.2 Informal or informal interviews with faculty, ask the following question:

At what point in the curriculum would students typically take [insert the name of a

major course here]? Repeat this question several times until different faculty members confirm courses and levels.

7.3 In formal and informal interviews with students, ask the following question: Are there other students with whom you typically take courses within the teacher preparation program? If so, name some of those students and the courses.

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

VIII: At some point in the program, cohorts encounter a milestone or benchmark or shared ordeal (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 250).

Faculty and student interviews were conducted to collect this data. Additionally, course syllabi were reviewed to establish whether there was any evidence of specific evaluative measurements that might identify milestones or benchmarks. Mitchell states that students should be aware of other students who are a "part" of their cohort group within the program and be able to identify either specific courses or challenging experiences which resulted in some level of pride upon attainment. Schlechty (1985) states, in regards to effective induction programs:

> In an effective induction system, entry into the occupation is marked by distinct stages and statues. Ceremony, ritual, and symbols accompany the successful completion of each stage. Each status carries with it a distinct set of performance duties, rights, and obligations...time, grade and

> performance are related to status in fully developed occupations. (p. 39)
>
> (Howey and Zimpher, 1989, p. 250)

Justification for this Indicator comes from Howey and Zimpher's (1989) studies in which it is stated that "...students were able to identify signal events to which they attached particular significance in terms of meeting the demands placed upon them and in terms of achieving a greater sense of status having met these challenges. Students prior to entering this series of courses or activities, invariably expressed apprehension" (p. 250).

Evidence

8.1 Students should be able to identify a course or an experience that is consistently described as very challenging, such as a course or experience that involves some trepidation and, preferably, some pride upon accomplishment. Something out of the ordinary, such as a particularly challenging practicum, interview, exam, or other experience, should be identified.

8.2 Faculty should be able to identify a course or a set of experiences that represent a challenge and or is unique to this HPETE program.

Information Sources

8.1 In formal and informal interviews with students, ask the following questions:

(a) Is there any part of this program that you consider to be a potential roadblock to you becoming a teacher?

(b) Is there a point in this program, prior to graduation, at which you believe your ability to teach will be (or has been) proven?

(c) Is there an experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get?

(d) Is there an experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same discipline in other parts of the state or country have (if known)?

8.2 In formal and informal interviews with faculty ask the following questions:

(a) Are there any experiences that HPETE student teachers have that are somewhat unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get? Are there any experiences that are somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same discipline in other parts of the state or country experience?

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

IX. Organizational and structural features of the programs enable an interdisciplinary or integrative approach to curriculum (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 250).

Curriculum organized with specific courses taken together is customarily referred to as "the block," the "primary effect of which was to allow students to address, repeatedly, core teaching functions and concepts such as planning for instruction across different subject areas" (pp. 250-251). The elementary school curriculum is multidisciplinary in nature, so the basis is that elementary teachers will frequently integrate concepts across subject matter to accommodate this broad curriculum. Thus,

justification for this curriculum integration makes modeling important. Mitchell includes that there needs to be opportunities for students within a program to take courses with students from other disciplines and departments. Integration of key concepts from other disciplines should be modeled by program faculty (i.e. using psychological principles to explain levels of learning in a methods course). Additionally, discussions should include how to facilitate the teaching of key concepts of a given program in other subject areas, and should be modeled by faculty.

It should be noted that being informed of "how specific knowledge matter is organized and how *conceptual* learning in specific subjects is acquired cannot be sacrificed. Additionally, integrated, interdisciplinary broad fields of curriculum design are not usually best taught across more than two or three subjects" (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251). They suggested that teacher education programs put more emphasis on collaborative or "team" teaching in elementary school teacher preparation programs due to each teacher possessing knowledge of *specific* subjects complementing one another, than was the norm at the time. Thus, in this study, faculty, cooperating teacher, and student interviews were conducted to collect information about the organizational and structural features of the program and how these accommodate interdisciplinary and or integrative approaches to curriculum.

Evidence

9.1 There are opportunities for students within the program to take courses with students from other departments and disciplines.

9.2 Discussions about how to facilitate the teaching of key concepts of other disciplines in physical education settings is encouraged and modeled by faculty (i.e., using biology and the study of mammalian physiology to examine human performance in fitness units; linking literature and/or poetry to study dance etc.).

9.3 Discussion about how to facilitate the teaching of key concepts of physical education in other subject areas is encouraged and modeled by faculty (i.e., calculating batting averages in a math class; using professional sport franchises to study geography or economics, etc.).

Information Sources

9.1 In formal or informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:

(a) (Students) What course(s) have you ever taken with students who are not in the same teaching track as you?

(b) (Faculty) What course(s) do your students take with students pursuing different career tracks?

9.2 In formal or informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:

(a) (Students) Are there any topics that you have covered in other courses that you have seen covered by your [physical education] faculty where you he been told how to link the ideas? For example, have there been any math or biology topics that have also been discussed in physical education?

(b) (Faculty) Are there any topics or concepts from other courses that you try to integrate into [physical education] courses? If yes, what concepts (please be specific) and into what physical education courses, in what way(s) please be specific)?

9.3 In formal or informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:

(a) (Students) Are there any topics that you have covered in physical education courses that you have seen covered by instructors in other courses? For example, have batting averages or percent body fat ever been used as examples in a math class; have any professional sport franchises been used to study geography or economics, etc.?

(b) (Faculty) Have you ever offered or been asked for, by instructors who teach courses outside of your discipline, suggestions regarding concepts that might be relevant to your discipline? If yes, what concepts (please be specific) and into what courses outside your discipline

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

X: Adequate "life space" is found within the curriculum (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).

Howey and Zimpher (1989) found in their studies that some programs have students starting their educational studies in the freshman year. Over time, during their matriculation, students stated that they had revisited concepts in the curriculum and

indicated clarity in understanding and ability and confidence to employ them that came over time. They point out that the interrelated concepts of both scope and sequence are important aspects in the design of a program, and *that inadequate time collapses sequence and broadens scope* (p. 251). "The question of how much study of different subjects, related or not, one can engage in productively at any given time should be considered in tandem with the ordering of a program's content, concepts, and activities" (p. 251).

Mitchell identifies that there should be realistic possibilities for students to have more than one route to a final degree. Perhaps offering more than one time slot for any given class in two sequential semesters to meet scheduling challenges, or possibly offering an alternative degree program leading to initial certification. Also, students should be able to describe opportunities they have had to process and integrate knowledge and skills learned in one part of the program to an earlier or later part of the program.

To assess this Indicator, faculty and student interviews were conducted along with the review of course catalogs to determine if adequate "life space" could be identified within the curriculum framework of the program, and whether students were able to identify this as being a realistic part or consideration of the program.

Evidence

10.1 There are realistic possibilities for students to take more than one route to a final degree. This may involve options for electives, the scheduling of at least some required classes to more than one time slot per year, and/or alternative degree

programs leading to initial certification (i.e., possibly an undergraduate degree, combined degrees with other certifications, graduate degrees, etc.).

10.2 Students should be able to describe opportunities to process and integrate knowledge and skills learned in one part of the program, in later parts of the program.

Information Sources

10.1 First, utilizing a formal course catalog, review to find the institutions prescribed program routes to initial certification in the discipline. Then, in formal and informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:

(a) (Students) Does everyone who wants to get the same degree as you have to take exactly the same courses? Do you know anyone who has been able to find courses different from what you have had to take?

(b) (Faculty) There are alternatives listed in your catalog for acquiring initial certification. Are these alternatives realistic possibilities for students (i.e., versus "possible" but not "plausible")?

10.2 In formal and informal interviews with students ask the following questions:

(a) Are there any topics, concepts, or skills that you learned early in your program that you had a chance to revisit, relearn, or apply in courses later in your program? For example, was there anything specific you might have done in a skill performance class that you later were able to apply in a practicum? Give more than one example if possible and please be specific.

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

> **XI: There are adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived Laboratory component in the program** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).

As noted in Howey and Zimpher's study, it should not be underestimated that the nature and character of physical environments are very important in learning how to teach. Having access to the equipment, supplies, and technologies, a student is expected to teach with is a critical aspect of a teacher education program.

Mitchell's (2000) assessment directs that there should be multiple sources for students to consult for curricular decisions (i.e. more than one resource per course) and instructional resources such as VCRs, monitors, tape recorders, computers and overhead projectors should be available to them as well.

Assessment for this Indicator was attained by conducting interviews with faculty and students. Interviews were conducted along with the compilation of a full inventory list compiled by this researcher of the equipment and supplies used by the department faculty and students. Additionally, the laboratories utilized by the students were also visited and assessed for verification of content.

Evidence

11.1 There are materials available to students such that they may consult more than one source for curricular decisions (i.e., more than one methods course; more than one activity resource—books, films, cassettes, etc.).

11.2 There are instructional resources available to students such as VCR's, audio tape and CD players, overhead projectors, slide and film projectors, computers, and the like.

Information Sources

11.1 In formal or informal interviews with students, ask the following question:

(a) If you had a question about what to teach or how to teach it, who could you ask or where would you look for help? For example, are there any course notes, course texts, or course instructors to which you could turn? If yes, which ones?

11.2 Request an inventory of available equipment in the department. Then, ask students the following questions:

(a) If you had to teach an activity tomorrow, are there any instructional resources that are available to you in this department that you could use? For example, are you aware of any books, films, or other instructional aides that you could borrow for instructional purposes (i.e., to show to a class)?

(b) If you had any instructional resources, would you be able to get the appropriate means to use them? For example, can you get a VCR and monitor, or, computer(s), projectors and the like?

(c) Have you or any other students that you know ever tried to use either the instructional materials or means of presentation just addressed above?

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

XII: There are numerous curriculum articulations between the activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 252).

In Koehler's (1985) article on *Research in preservice teacher education,* the concept of "feed-forward" is discussed in the area of teacher preparation. It refers to students being able to engage in discussions dealing with pedagogical principles and curricular concepts in the university setting in the morning and then in the same afternoon utilize, if not experiment with them, in their clinical settings (school classrooms). In their studies, they accentuated the effectiveness of "modeling" by explaining that the college faculty emulate the concepts in the schools by working closely with the classroom teachers, at least, for short periods of time. Mitchell (2000) states that students should be able to integrate through experience what is done in the classroom on campus is also done in the appropriate P-12 classrooms. Also, the course syllabi should articulate this integration through stated examples and coordinated assignments in the "school

classroom" setting with CTs who should have a clear understanding of the students need for "articulated" experiences. The university faculty member(s) and the CTs should have a common understanding of the needed experiences for students in the P-12 setting to complement and balance their campus learning.

Thus, with this in mind, faculty, student, and cooperating teacher interviews were conducted to discuss and determine if there were definitive curriculum articulations present between the activities that occur on campus and those that occur in the schools. Course syllabi were also reviewed to identify whether or not these articulations were present.

Evidence

12.1 Students are given the opportunity to see how what is done in the classroom on campus translates to what is done in the appropriate P-12 setting.

12.2 Course syllabi provide examples of articulations which may involve students going to the school setting and/or school personnel coming to the university setting, with a range of interaction styles (i.e., discussions, observations, assisting, and working with individual students, small groups, whole classes, and even classes across a unit of instruction.

12.3 Teachers who supervise in the P-12 setting should have a clear understanding of the experiences students have on the university campus and a sense of what this means in terms of skills and needs of students when they arrive in the filed settings.

12.4 Teachers and university faculty should have a shared understanding of the experiences students need in the P-12 setting to complement their campus learning.

Information Sources

12.1 In formal and informal interviews with students, ask the following questions:

(a) Is there anything that you've ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also heard "real" teachers in schools talk about? For example, how to deal with discipline, how to develop content, etc.? If yes, please provide specific examples.

(b) Is there anything you've ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also had a chance to try in a "real" instructional setting with "real" students? If yes, please provide specific examples.

12.2 If comprehensive syllabi are available, search for examples of school site visits, practicum experiences, or visits from pupils and/or teachers to the campus. Then, in formal and informal interviews with faculty and students, ask the following questions:

(a) (Students) Have you ever had to design one or more lessons for pupils and then taught them as part of a course requirement?

(b) (Students) Have you ever been visited by teachers from local schools (or have you visited them) as part of a course requirement? If yes, please describe the nature of the interaction.

(c) (Faculty) Are there any courses in this program where students are given the chance to work with pupils or to interact with teachers currently working in local schools? If yes, please describe the nature of those experiences and interactions.

12.3 Identify teachers in local schools typically responsible for student practicum supervision and ask the following questions:

(a) Are you familiar with what kinds of courses students typically have completed prior to coming to work with you and your pupils?

(b) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students who come to work with you and your pupils?

(c) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be your responsibility to provide access to for students who come to work with you and your pupils?

12.4 In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following questions and compare responses to questions 3(b) and (c) above:

(a) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students before they go to work with local schoolteachers and their pupils?

(b) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be the responsibility of cooperating teachers to provide access to for students who go to work with them and their pupils?

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

XIII: There is some direct linkage with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 253).

In the early 1980's, Shalock (1983) looked extensively at the "methodological, political, and practical problems associated with research into *programs* of teacher education" (p. 8). Shalock (1983), along with Howey and Zimpher, argued that at that time, more coherent program development had to occur before one could engage in a well-conceived study of costs and benefits which accompany such model variations. Additionally they stated that "...a major long-range agenda for the Holmes Group should have been the development of core, "standardized" curriculum and instructional artifacts which could contribute to the fuller delineation of similar programs across institutions and which in turn will facilitate replicable programmatic research and development" (Howey and Zimpher, 1989, p. 254).

For many years in the field of education, teacher preparation programs were expected to have some direct linkage with research and development into teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education. This should not only be isolated to the research-oriented universities.

In his recent studies, Mitchell iterates that what is now done in teacher education programs should be identifiably tied to research, either by faculty guiding students in

research projects, students interpreting the original research of faculty, or through students translating existing research completed by others (p. 239).

To assess this Indicator, faculty, student, and cooperating teacher interviews were aimed towards determining if there were linkages with research and development within the curriculum content and the processes of the HPETE program.

Evidence

13.1 What is done in the teacher preparation program can be tied to research. This linkage can be tied through the engagement by faculty of students in research projects; application or interpretation of original research of faculty; or through the translation of existing research completed by others.

Information Sources

13.1 In formal and informal interviews with faculty and students, ask the following questions:

(a) (Students) Have you ever participated in a research project that was being administered by a faculty member in this department?

(b) (Students) Are you familiar with any research or researchers who have completed work that supports the ways in which you develop content or instruct in physical education? If yes, please identify someone or something (please be specific).

(c) (Faculty) Have you ever engaged students in research that you were doing? If yes, please, provide examples and be specific.

(d) (Faculty) Do you identify specific researchers or research results that support particular ways of developing content or designing instruction for your students? If yes, please provide specific examples.

(e) (Faculty) Is your program designed to apply any principles of effective teaching or teacher preparation? If yes, please identify the parts or places in the program and the foundational research to support the experiences or program design. Please be specific.

Benchmarks

The Benchmark Rubric for this Indicator is located in Appendix A.

XIV: A plan for systematic program evaluation exists (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 253).

In their studies, Howey and Zimpher (1989) found that there was slight, if any evidence that systematic program evaluation occurred, however they could not deny it's great value. They also emphasized that programs needed to engage in more than merely doing course evaluations or follow-up studies of the graduates of a program and their perceptions of the programs from which they graduated.

In Mitchell's (2000) study, it is suggested that programs should have external assessment, internal assessment or an auditing of the existing program delivery. Along with these assessments should be evidence of the implementation of program changes, plans for implementation, or a reasonable explanation for why there will be no implementation of findings from the program's assessment efforts.

Thus, to assess this Indicator, interviews with department faculty, staff, and students along with a review of the departmental data bank documents were conducted to inform this study of any ongoing evaluation procedures in the program (1989, p. 253).

Evidence

14.1 External assessment, internal assessment or an auditing of existing program delivery occurs.

14.2 There is evidence of implementation, a plan for implementation, or a reasonable explanation for why there will be no implementation of findings from the program assessment efforts.

Information Sources

14.1 In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following question:

(a) Have you ever participated in or are you aware of either an internal audit or an invited external audit (other than as mandated by an accreditation agency) of this program? If yes, please elaborate, who, what, why, and when.

14.2 In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following question:

(a) As a result of any form of assessment of this program, whether voluntary or by accreditation mandate, what, if any, plans exist for making revisions to this program? Please be specific and provide documentation if available.

Summary

The methodologies used in this study have been very fruitful for the purpose of gathering useful programmatic information. By looking at the numerous information sources, it is reasonable and enlightening to acquire the wealth of information that can be utilized for the purpose of program improvement. Use of this and other referenced assessment instruments can provide a teacher education program with invaluable information for quality change and educational reform.

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter provides the analysis of the data collected for the fourteen indicators of coherence in this case study of the GSU HPETE program. Note that each indicator has several sections to it as is detailed in Appendix A and each Indicator is addressed separately. A chart format has been utilized for clarity in understanding the ratings. At the end of each section within each indicator, ratings are given and the averaged scores are given at the end of each Indicator.

A five-point rating scale was used with 5 meaning strong evidence of coherence, 4 meaning moderate evidence of coherence, 3 meaning low evidence of coherence, 2 meaning no evidence of coherence and 1 meaning that not enough information was available to make a determination.

Within each indicator, several questions were asked of the faculty members, students, cooperating teachers, or the program staff. If questions were not asked, then documents were reviewed or other areas of the program were assessed and data were collected. Thus, the scores were generated based on the assessment being done within that particular indicator. The final rating score for each indicator is the averaged score based on all the information collected for that particular indicator.

Indicator I: Are the teacher preparation programs driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching? Table 2 shows faculty response ratings for question 1.1.

Table 2

Faculty Response Ratings for Question 1.1

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.1.a	What do you see as the main purposes of schools?				X		
1.1.b	Where in the curriculum is this communicated to the students?	X					
1.1.c	What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in P-12 schools?		X				3.7
1.1.d	Where in the curriculum is this communicated to the students?	X					
1.1.e	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in schools? Elementary level.		X				
1.1.f	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in schools? Middle School level.			X			
1.1.g	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in schools? High School level.			X			
1.1.h	Where in the curriculum is this communicated to the students?	X					

Based on the responses of the faculty in 1.1, this aspect of Indicator I rates a 3.7, Low Evidence of Coherency because about one-third of the faculty members consistently responded with similar terms in the areas targeted.

1.2.a: Review syllabi to see if they reflect expectations consistent with beliefs expressed by faculty. Table 3 shows the rating of 3 which reflects Low Evidence of Coherency since only about one-third of the syllabi show clear coordinated connections between course objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and assessments of student performance. This approach was chosen to facilitate the collection of data over that of interviewing faculty members for clarification. The results of the components analyzed follows: Collect course syllabi for each of the courses in the program indicated by the answers to the questions above. If the documents are comprehensive, search for the extent to which purposes and/or functions are explicitly addressed in the formal course objectives, in the outline of learning experiences, in the description of course assignments, and/or in the strategies for assessment of student performance.

Table 3

Results of Course Syllabi Review Process

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.2.a	Review course syllabi for consistencies.			X			3
1.2.b	Not utilized for this study.						

The option of going back to discuss course syllabi content and/or the lack of information in course syllabi with the faculty was not taken. This would have been "digging" for coherence. Each individual syllabus was utilized to assess its level of comprehensiveness since this was information the department wanted to know. Utilization of course syllabi without faculty clarification resulted in an inadequate amount of information to show a fair measure. This was primarily due to this instrument not being utilized by the faculty in the development of their syllabi. Table 4 shows the results of this assessment.

Table 4

Syllabi Assessment Results

Course Name and Number	Components Match	Components Do Not Match	Unable To Determine	None or too few Components To Compare
Motor Learning and Development KH 2220			X	
Musculoskeletal Function and Human Performance Physiology KH 2230			X	
Introduction to Health Education KH 3000			X	
Performance and Analysis Area I: Movement and Rhythmics KH 3010			X	

Table 4 (continued)

Course Name and Number	Components Match	Components Do Not Match	Unable To Determine	None or too few Components To Compare
Performance and Analysis Area II: Training and Fitness KH 3020			X	
Performance and Analysis Area III: Team Sports KH 3030				X
Performance and Analysis Area IV: Lifetime Sports KH 3040				X
Performance and Analysis Area V: Lifetime Sports KH 3050	X			
Instructional Skills for Health and Physical Education KH 3200			X	
Evaluation and Instrumentation in Physical Education KH 3550	X			
Biomechanics KH 3600			X	
Biomechanics Lab KH 3600L			X	

Table 4 (continued)

Course Name and Number	Components Match	Components Do Not Match	Unable To Determine	None or too few Components To Compare
Motor Learning and Development KH 3610			X	
Exercise Physiology KH 3650			X	
Applied Physiology Lab KH 3650L			X	
(TE) Practicum in Health and Physical Education KH 3660	X			
Curriculum and Instruction for Pre- and Elementary Physical Education KH 4510	X			
Curriculum & Instruction for Secondary Physical Education KH 4520	X			
Methods and Materials: Health Education KH 4530	X			
Curriculum & Instruction for Adapted and Inclusive Physical Education KH 4540	X			

Table 4 (continued)

Course Name and Number	Components Match	Components Do Not Match	Unable To Determine	None or too few Components To Compare
Opening School Experience in Health and Physical Education KH 4650	X			
Student Teaching in Health &Physical Education P-12 KH 4660	X			
Student Teaching in Health and Physical Education P-12 Capstone Seminar KH 4700	X			

Based on the use of this assessment piece, the rating for this section of Indicator I is 3, Low Evidence of Coherence since only about 42 % of the course syllabi show clear connections between the course objectives, coordinated learning experiences, course assignments, and the evaluation criteria.

Special Note: The areas addressed in 1.2.a (review of course syllabi for coherence) would also need to be reviewed by students to determine if the espoused (epistemological) content is also the (ontological) real content which they received in their courses.

1.2.b: Interview course instructors to gather insight into each of the areas described above. This mode of assessment was not used, however to adequately answer

this item, it would have been necessary to have each faculty member go through his or her courses and address each item on the chart, specifically providing information as follows:

- Course name and number
- Specific objective and number
- Coordinated learning experiences
- Coordinated course assignments
- Evaluation criteria related to each objective
- Components match or do not match (yes or no)

In Table 5 you can see that the rating for question 1.3 of this section of Indicator I is a 4.6 rounded up to a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence since views of each student were consistent and common language was used to describe their understanding of the purposes of schools, teachers, and physical education in the schools.

Table 5

Student Response Ratings for Questions in 1.3

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.3.a	What do you see as the main purposes of schools?		X				
1.3.b	Where in the curriculum are these purposes communicated to the students?	X					

Table 5 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.3.c	What do you consider to be the main function(s) of schools?		X				
1.3.d	Where in the curriculum do you believe these functions are communicated tot he students?	X					
1.3.e	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in Elementary schools?	X					4.6
1.3.f	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in Middle schools?	X					
1.3.g	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in High schools?	X					
1.3.h	Where in the curriculum do you believe these purposes are communicated to the students?	X					

Table 5 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.3.i	Looking over the syllabi in front of you, of the courses you have taken, are there any differences in what is indicated and your actual experience(s) in the course? If yes, please explain.		X				

As shown in Table 6, the rating for 1.4 is a 3.3 rounded down to 3, since at least half of the staff members' responses were consistent, yet lacked complete agreement with the views of the faculty and students.

Table 6

Staff Response Ratings for Questions in 1.4

Item Number	Question (Staff)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.4.a	What do you see as the main purposes of schools?	X					
1.4.b	Where in the curriculum are these purposes communicated to the students?					X	
1.4.c	What do you consider to be the main function(s) of schools?	X					3.3

Table 6 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Staff)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.4.d	Where in the curriculum do you believe these functions are communicated tot he students?					X	
1.4.e	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in Elementary schools?			X			
1.4.f	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in Middle schools?			X			
1.4.g	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in High schools?		X				
1.4.h	Where in the curriculum do you believe these purposes are communicated to the students?			X			
1.4.i	What resource materials/equipment/teaching resources are available for student use?	X					

1.5 Major program course syllabi were reviewed, as shown in Table 7, to determine if the course objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and evaluation

Table 7

Match Between Course Objectives and Course Activities and Experiences

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.5	Review major program course syllabi to determine if the objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria "match-up" to meet the intended objectives.			X			3

criteria "match-up" to meet the intended objectives. This table summary can be found in Appendix E. The findings indicate an overall rating of 3, Low Evidence of Coherence since at least one third of the stated objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria match the views and outcomes of the designated courses.

As shown in Table 8, based on the overall findings in this section, the rating for 1.6 is a 5, since the cooperating teachers interviewed agreed on 90% or more of the questions asked and their responses were consistent. Indicator I average score is 3.7 with a low of 1 and a high of 5.

Table 8

Cooperating Teachers Responses to Questions in 1.6

Item Number	Question (Cooperating Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
1.6.a	What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in schools?	X					
1.6.b	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in Elementary schools?	X					5
1.6.c	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in Middle schools?	X					
1.6.d	What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in High schools?	X					

Indicator II: Do the faculty members appear to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles? Faculty response results follow in Table 9.

Table 9

Faculty Response Ratings for Questions in 2.1

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
2.1.a	Are there different groups of faculty within this department who have shared interests (in a particular focus area in Physical Education)? If yes, can you	X					5
2.1.b	Who is primarily responsible for the design and delivery of the teacher preparation program?	X					
2.1.c	Who decides when and how revisions might be required in the teacher preparation program?	X					

Based on the responses to this section of Indicator II, the rating is a 5, because there is a clearly defined group of full-time faculty members responsible for the design, delivery, and revisions of the teacher preparation program.

Based on the results of this next section of Indicator II, as shown in Table 10, the rating is a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence because all of the program faculty discuss and agree upon course syllabi that vary minimally if at all by instructor for any designated session, and content is primarily consistent across instructors.

Table 10

Rating of Findings Related to Course Syllabi Development and Faculty Delivery

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
2.2.a	What are the main courses in the physical education program curriculum?	X					
2.2.b	Who is responsible for preparing course outlines, syllabi, and teaching the course?	X					5
2.2.c	Has more than one faculty member ever taught specific courses? If yes, does the course differ dramatically from one faculty member to another? If yes, in what ways do they differ?	X					

Responses to this section of Indicator 2 as shown in Table 11, receive a rating of 5, since faculty input to course content is regularly sought, the program is improving and faculty would be willing to have their own children be taught by graduates from this program.

Table 11

Faculty Response Ratings for Questions in 2.3

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
2.3.a	Do you feel your input is sought and valued regarding how this program is designed and delivered?	X					5
2.3.b	Do you feel that graduates from this program now are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago? If yes, why. If no, why?	X					
2.3.c	If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from this program being his or her teacher next year?	X					

As shown in Table 12, responses to this section of Indicator 2 received a rating of 5, since both of the cooperating teachers responses were in agreement and consistent with each other. They have worked with the student teachers from this institution prior to and including the past 5 years, and they agree that the graduates have improved considerably over this time period. They also agreed that the student teachers would be excellent teachers for their own children. Indicator II averaged score was 5.

Table 12

Cooperating Teacher Responses to Questions in 2.4

Item Number	Question (Cooperating Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
2.4.a	How many years have you acted in the capacity of a cooperating teacher (CT)?	X					
2.4.b	How many years with Georgia State University (GSU)?	X					5
2.4.c	If more than 5 years, do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago: If yes, why?	X					
2.4.d	If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from GSU's HPETE program being his or her teacher next year.	X					

Indicator III: Is there a sense of understanding and clarity associated with the major goals of the program?

Based on the findings of this section 3.1, and shown in Table 13, the rating is 3, Low Evidence of Coherence because only a few of the faculty members are able to identify and produce the documents. While they know the present curriculum was designed using them, they were not able to easily put their hands on them.

Table 13

Faculty Response Rating for Question 3.1

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
3.1	Can you produce a written copy of the major goals of the program?			X			3

Based on the responses from the faculty, and as seen in Table 14, this item is rated 4.5, rounded up to 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence since goals are seen as realistic and achievable and faculty members were able to state the major goals with clear evidence on how and where goals are addressed in the program. However, they were unable to produce written copies.

The major goals of the HPETE program stem from the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) Standards. These standards were the basis for the reorganization of the HPETE program. Each of the 9 Standards can be identified in the HPETE planned program. See complete chart in Appendix B.

Table 14

Faculty Response Ratings to Questions in 3.2

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
3.2.a	Do these goals make sense to you or are they filled with empty rhetoric?	X					

Table 14 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
3.2.b	Ask each faculty member to identify one or two of the major goals (i.e. from memory rather than as read from a document, then choose one or two goals and ask where in the program the goals are addressed.		X				4.5

Based on the evidence for this section the rating is a 4, Moderate Evidence of Coherence because connections between program goals and course descriptions are clear and it is possible to expect goals will be achieved. Yet, the experiences described leave room for some question of the measurable extent to which the goals will be achieved. This is shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Ratings for Coverage of Program Standards in Course Syllabi

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
3.3	Review course syllabi for major courses and look for links to the major goals.		X				4

The rating for this section 3.4 is a 5, since cooperating teachers are able to identify program goals and objectives and indicate that they clearly make sense. This is shown in Table 16. Indicator III averaged score is 4 with a low of 3 and a high of 5.

Table 16

Cooperating Teachers Responses to Question 3.4

Item Number	Question (Cooperating Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
3.4	Are you familiar with the major goals and objectives of the HPE program at GSU? Do they make sense to you or are they just senseless rhetoric?	X					5

Indicator IV: Is the program rigorous and academically challenging to the point that students have to work hard to achieve? Results of responses are shown below in Table 17.

Table 17

Results of reviewing Institutional Documents

Item Number	Question (Institutional Documents)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
4.1.a	Identify the minimum grade point average (GPA) from high school and or standardized test score required for entry into the institution.	X					5
4.1.b	Identify the minimum GPA required for entry into the teacher preparation program.	X					

Table 17 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Institutional Documents)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
4.1.c	Identify the minimum GPA to remain academically eligible to continue toward a degree.	X					
4.1.d	Identify the minimum GPA to remain academically eligible to continue toward teacher certification.	X					
4.1.e	Identify the minimum GPA for graduation, as mandated by the institution.	X					
4.1.f	Identify the minimum GPA for graduation within the teaching option.	X					

The rating for this section of Indicator 4 is a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence since guidelines for entry, retention, and graduation are well above institutional minimums.

A student must have a 2.75 GPA for entry and must maintain a 2.50 to continue in the program to graduation since the student must maintain a minimum of a C average in all major courses. Thus, as shown in Table 18, the rating for this part of Indicator 4 is a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence since specific guidelines are published in a formal institutional document that is readily accessible to prospective and current students.

Table 18

Results of Findings in Item 4.2

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
4.2	Review a copy of the PETE program guidelines to identify requirements for entry, continuing eligibility, and graduation from the department.	X					5

As a result of reviewing the grades of 62 students from the HPETE program, it is clear that not all students receive A's in each course. The following numbers were generated from the records of 62 students grade reports (actual chart can be found in Appendix F). Thus, this section of Indicator 4 is rated 5, a Very Strong Evidence of Coherence. This is shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Grade Distribution Rating

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
4.3	Review copies of course grades for several courses within the major to match grades received with the relevant course syllabus where requirements for course grades are described.	X					5

Total numbers are as follows: Number of courses: 25

A's = 681 B's = 351 C's = 110 D's = 23 F's = 7

W's = 30 S's = 49 No Grade = 10

Of the students interviewed, all but two indicated that the "Block" was the most challenging. The other two areas were the Biomechanics course, and the Praxis Math test. The results of item 4.4 are in Table 20. The rating for this section of Indicator IV is a 5 since the students were able to identify specific parts of the program that challenged them intellectually or emotionally and not just from a stamina perspective. Indicator IV's averaged score is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

Table 20

Pre/Post Student Teacher Responses to Items in 4.4

Item Number	Question (Pre/Post Student Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
4.4.a	Describe one or more parts of the teacher preparation program that challenged you.	X					5
4.4.b	Explain how the aspects of courses described were challenging.	X					

Indicator V: Do themes run throughout the curriculum like threads in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences?

Based on the responses of the faculty, this section of Indicator 5 receives a rating of 5, since goals are clearly identified, and faculty members can articulate how treatment of duplicate concepts is different in early courses from that which is done in advanced courses. This is shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Faculty Response to Item 5.1

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
5.1	How might one of the major goals of the program be covered differently in one course than in another?	X					5

Faculty members were able to present course outlines and explain the purpose and objectives served for each assignment. Course outlines reflect differential treatment of similar concepts across courses. Thus, this section rates a 5. See Table 22 for rating results.

Table 22

Faculty Response to Item 5.2

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
5.2	Inquire with faculty members for copies of assignments given in their classes and the purposes of those assignments.	X					5

Based on the student responses, this section rated a 5 as shown in Table 23. The assignments in the course outlines were actually assigned and graded.

Table 23

Student Response to Item 5.3

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
5.3	Ask students if assignments in the course syllabi were actually assigned and graded.	X					5

Based on the CT's responses, this section rated a 5 as shown in Table 24. The teachers identified common skills and knowledge base information they have identified the student teachers have mastered. This is possible due to the close contact and information sharing done by the college faculty with the cooperating teachers in addition to the program being field based.

Table 24

Cooperating Teachers' Response to Item 5.4

Item Number	Question (Cooperating Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
5.4	What kinds of knowledge and skills do you find GSU students have mastered?	X					5

Based on the CT's responses and as shown in Table 25, this section rated a 5. The CT's identified the same knowledge base information and skills which they are expected to reinforce with the student teachers.

Table 25

Cooperating Teachers' Response to Item 5.5

Item Number	Question (Cooperating Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
5.5	What kinds of knowledge and skills are you expected to reinforce with student teachers?	X					5

As indicated in 5.5 above and 5.6 below, this communication is open and clear. A handbook is utilized with the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervising teachers, which makes this a strong area (see Table 26). Indicator V averaged score is 5.

Table 26

Cooperating Teachers' Responses to Item 5.6

Item Number	Question (Cooperating Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
5.6.a	Have the GSU supervising teachers communicated with you to discover what is taught?	X					
5.6.b	Have the GSU supervising teachers communicated with you to discuss types of experiences and expectations?	X					5
5.6.c	Have the GSU supervising teachers communicated with you to describe what their student's need from their student teaching experiences?	X					

Indicator VI: Is there an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge, which can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development?

Based on the responses to this section of Indicator 6.1, and as shown in Table 27, the rating is 4, Moderate Evidence of Coherency. This is because faculty can describe only a few attempts to link their pedagogical efforts with faculty who teach general education courses, yet with cooperating teachers, the linkages are very evident and clearly specified and many concrete examples of how concepts are linked across all three areas (general, pedagogical, experiential) could be identified in the curriculum.

Table 27

Faculty Response Results of Item 6.1

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
6.1.a	Can you identify anything that students learn in any general required course (i.e. history, psychology, math, etc) that is somehow reinforced in a methods course and/or in a practicum experience?			X			4
6.1.b	Have you ever communicated with general education						

Table 27 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
	instructors who typically teach courses that teacher preparation students take to discover that is taught or to describe what your students need from those courses? If so what if any modifications have been made to any courses?		X				
6.1.c	Have you ever communicated with cooperating teachers who typically supervise students in practicum experiences to discover what is taught, types of experiences and expectations, or to describe what your students need from those experiences? If so, what if any modifications have been made to any courses or experiences.	X					

The rating for this section of Indicator 6 is 4 since students are able to make content knowledge connections between earlier program course content and those that came later in the program (see Table 28).

Table 28

Student Responses to Questions in Item 6.2

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
6.2	Can you identify anything that you have learned in any general education required course (i.e. history, psychology, math, etc.) that is somehow reinforced in a methods course and/or in a practicum experience?		X				4

The rating for this section of Indicator 6 is a 3, Low Evidence of Coherence because course instructors are unable to confirm the connections addressed in responses related to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within and/or beyond the program. This is shown in Table 29. Indicator VI averaged score is 3 with a low of 3 and a high of 5.

Table 29

Student Responses to Item 6.3

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
6.3	Can you identify course objectives, lecture/lab topics related to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within and/or beyond the program.			X			3.2

Indicator VII: Do student cohort groups exist? Based on the review of major HPETE courses across 4 semesters, the rating for this sections of Indicator 7 is 5 because it is possible to identify groups of students that appear to form cohorts across three or more semesters/quarters within the program. This is shown in Table 30.

Table 30

Results of Reviewing Course Rosters for Evidence of Cohort Groupings

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
7.1	Review student rosters to determine the extent to which the same names appear on courses sequenced across time.	X					5

Based on the findings of this next section of Indicator 7, the rating is a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence since each of the faculty members in the program are able to identify the typical placement of major courses within the program. See results in Table 31.

Table 31

Faculty Responses to Item 7.2

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
7.2	At what point in the curriculum would students typically take (Anatomy and Physiology)?	X					5

Based on the student responses, this section of Indicator 7 receives the rating of 5 because each student interviewed could identify other students whom form their cohort within the program. The results are shown in Table 32. Indicator VII averaged score is 5.

Table 32

Student Responses to Item 7.3

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
7.3	Are there other students with whom you typically take courses within the teacher preparation program? If so, name some of those students and the courses.	X					5

Indicator VIII: At some point in the program, do the cohort groups encounter milestones, benchmarks, or shared ordeals?

Based on the findings of this section of Indicator 8, the ranking is 5, since more than 8 students consistently identified a part of the program that is essentially challenging. Table 33 shows the ratings. Students identify numerous opportunities before graduation in which they are able to decipher whether they feel confident of their career choice, and are knowledgeable of how their program is noticeably different from other teacher preparation programs.

Table 33

Student Responses to the Challenges of the Program

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
8.1.a	Is there any part of this program that you consider to be a potential roadblock to you becoming a teacher?	X					
8.1.b	Is there a point in this program, prior to graduation, at which you believe your ability to teach will be (or has been) proven?	X					5
8.1.c	Is there an experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get?	X					
8.1.d	Is there an experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same discipline in other parts of the state or country experience?	X					

Thus, based on these findings, the rating for this section of Indicator 8 is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence. This is because the faculty members are able to identify a course, set of courses, or a set of experiences that represent challenges that are somewhat

unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other teacher preparation programs might get. Also, this program is unique to itself and even to other HPETE programs in other parts of the state of country. The results are shown in Table 34. Indicator VIII averaged score is 5.

Table 34

Faculty Responses to the Uniqueness of the Program

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
8.2.a	Are there any experiences that (HPE) student teachers have that are somewhat unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get?	X					5
8.2.b	Are there any experiences that are somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same discipline in other parts of the state or country experience.	X					

Indicator IX: Do the organizational and structural features of the program enable (allow for) an interdisciplinary or integrated approach to curriculum?

Based on the responses of the students and the faculty, this section of Indicator 9 receives a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence, because students and faculty are able to

identify courses where HPETE students are enrolled with students from other teaching tracks and other disciplines. This is shown in Table 35.

Table 35

Student and Faculty Responses to Items in 9.1

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
9.1.a	What course(s) have you ever taken with students who are not in the same teaching track as you?	X					5
9.1.b	(**Faculty**) What course(s) do your students take with students pursuing different career tracks?	X					

Based on the responses from the faculty, section 9.2 of Indicator 9 rates 4, Moderate Evidence of Coherency, because more than two students are able to specifically identify more than two concepts that are covered in general education courses and in physical education courses. Faculty members could provide specific examples of how they could link the topics in their own teaching. Responses are shown in Table 36.

As a result of the responses of the students and faculty members on section 9.3 of Indicator 9, the rating is 3, Low Evidence of Coherency since only one or two of the faculty members interviewed could identify one or more concepts covered in both general education courses and in physical education courses, and one or two of the faculty members could describe communications with general education faculty to provide

Table 36

Student and Faculty Responses to Questions in Item 9.2

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
9.2.a	**(Students)** Are there any topics that you have covered in other courses that you have seen covered in your (Physical Education) major courses?		X				4
9.2.b	**(Faculty)** Are there any topics or concepts from other courses that you try to integrate into physical education courses? If yes, what concepts and into what physical education courses, and in what way(s)?		X				

insights into how physical education and other disciplines might overlap. This is shown in Table 37. Indicator IX averaged score is 4 with a low of 3 and a high of 5.

Table 37

Student and Faculty Responses to Questions in Item 9.3

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
9.3.a	**(Students)** Are there any topics that you have covered in Physical Education courses that you have seen covered by instructors in other courses?			X			3

Table 37 (continued)

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
9.3.b	**(Faculty)** Have you ever offered or been asked for, by instructors who teach courses outside of your discipline, suggestions regarding concepts that might be relevant to your discipline? If yes, what concepts and into what courses outside your discipline?			X			

Indicator X: Is adequate life space found within the curriculum? Based on the responses of the faculty and students, as shown in Table 38, this section of Indicator X rates 4, Moderate Evidence of Coherence, since more than two students and at least two faculty members are aware of and can identify specific students who have taken different routes to initial certification, (i.e. taking different courses, time frames, or course sequences, etc.) (Catalog, pp. 93-94).

Table 38

Student and Faculty Responses to Questions in Item 10.1

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
10.1.a	Does everyone who wants to get the same degree as you, have to take exactly the same courses? Do you know		X				4

Table 38 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
	anyone who has been able to find courses different from what you have had to take?						
10.1.b	(**Faculty**) There are alternatives listed in your catalog for acquiring initial certification. Are these alternatives realistic possibilities for students?		X				

Based on the responses of the student interviews, this section of Indicator X rates 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence since more than four students can identify more than two concepts that they addressed in different ways across at least two courses. This is shown in Table 39. Indicator X averaged score is 4.5, rounded up to 5, with a low of 4 and a high of 5.

Table 39

Student Responses to Questions in Item 10.2

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
10.2.a	Are there any topics, concepts, or skills that you learned early in your program that you had a chance to revisit, relearn, or apply in courses later in your program?	X					5

Indicator XI: Are there adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program?

Based on the responses of the students on this section of Indicator XI, as shown in Table 40, the rating is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence, because more than four students are able to identify more than two specific alternatives for accessing help they may need from faculty members or past course materials relating to curriculum content, instructional approaches, and/or resources available to them through the department.

Table 40

Student Responses to Questions in Item 11.1

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
11.1.a	If you had a question about what to teach or how to teach it, whom would you ask or where would you look for help?	X					5

Based on the responses from the students and the inventory check, the rating for this section of Indicator 11 is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherency since more than four students are able to identify specific instructional materials (i.e., videos, computer programs, etc.) and the means to use the materials from the department for an instructional assignment. Furthermore, at least one student is able to identify one or two specific students that have actually used the materials in an instructional assignment. The rating is shown in Table 41. Indicator XI averaged score is 5.

Table 41

Results of Findings Related to Equipment Availability and its Use by Students

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
11.2	Request an equipment inventory from the department.	X					
11.2.a	(Students) If you had to teach an activity tomorrow, are there any instructional resources that are available to you in this department that you could use?	X					5
11.2.b	If you had any instructional media resources to show in a class, would you be able to get the appropriate equipment to use them? (VCR, Overhead Projector, etc)	X					
11.2.c	Have you or any other students that you know ever tried to use either the instructional materials or means of presentation just addressed above?	X					

Indicator XII: Are there numerous curriculum articulations between activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools?

Based on the responses to this section of Indicator 12, the rating is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence since more than four students are able to provide more than two

specific examples each of instances where topics addressed in theory-based courses have been applied in practicum situations. The rating for this item is below in Table 42.

Table 42

Student Responses to Questions in Item 12.1

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
12.1.a	Is there anything that you have ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also heard "real" teachers in schools talk about?	X					5
12.1.b	Is there anything you've ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also had a chance to try in a "real" instructional setting with "real" students? If yes, please provide specific examples.	X					

Based on the interviews with students and faculty, along with the review of course syllabi, the rating for this section of Indicator 12 is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherency, because more than two students are able to provide more than two specific examples of opportunities to design and deliver instruction to "real" pupils. The ratings for this item are shown in Table 43.

Table 43

Student Responses to Questions in Items 12.2

Item Number	Question (Students)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
12.2.a	Have you ever had to design one or more lessons for pupils and then taught them as part of a course requirement?	X					
12.2.b	Have you ever been visited by teachers from local schools (or have you visited them) as part of a course requirement? If yes, please describe the nature of the interaction.	X					5
12.2.c	Are there any courses in this program where students are given the chance to work with pupils or to interact with teachers currently working in local schools? If yes, please describe the nature of those experiences and interactions.	X					

Based on the findings of this section of Indicator 12, and as shown in Table 44, the rating is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence, because two cooperating teachers consistently identified more than two types of knowledge and skill that they expect university students to bring to the practicum experience. These expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question.

Table 44

Cooperating Teachers' Responses to Questions in Item 12.3

Item Number	Question (Cooperating Teachers)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
12.3.a	Are you familiar with what kinds of courses students typically have completed prior to coming to work with you and your pupils?	X					5
12.3.b	What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students who come to work with you and your pupils?	X					
12.3.c	What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be your responsibility to provide access to for students who come to work with you and your pupils?	X					

Based on the feedback from the faculty members, this section of Indicator 12 receives a rating of 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence, because two cooperating teachers and university faculty members consistently identify more than two types of substantive knowledge and skills that they expect to make accessible to university students during practicum experiences, and these expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question. The responses are shown in Table 45. Indicator XII averaged score is 5.

Table 45

Faculty Responses Regarding Students' Knowledge Base Prior to Field Practice Teaching

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
12.4.a	What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students before they go to work with local schoolteachers and their pupils?	X					5
12.4.b	What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be the responsibility of cooperating teachers to provide access to for students who go to work with them and their pupils?	X					

Indicator XIII: Are there direct linkages with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education?

Based on the responses to this section of Indicator 13, the rating is 4, Moderate Evidence of Coherence, since two or more students and two or more faculty members can identify specific instances of involvement with ongoing research projects, and can link names of at least two different researchers with specific insights into curriculum and/or instructional practices in teaching and/or teacher education in physical education. Indicator XIII averaged score is 4 with a low of 4 and a high of 5. These ratings are shown in Tables 46 and 47.

Table 46

Students' Knowledge of Research Practices Within the Department

Item Number	Question	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
13.1.a	**(Students)** Have you ever participated in a research project that was being administered by a faculty member in this department?		X				4

Table 47

Student and Faculty Responses to Questions About Research Conducted in the Department

Item Number	Question (Students and Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
13.1.b	**(Students)** Are you familiar with any research or researchers who have completed work that supports the ways in which you develop content or instruct in physical education? If yes, please identify someone or something.		X				4
13.1.c	**(Faculty)** Have you ever-engaged students in research that you were doing? If yes, please provide examples and be specific. **Response was (Only as subjects).**		X				

Table 47 (continued)

Item Number	Question (Students and Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
13.1.d	**(Faculty)** Do you identify specific researchers or research results that support particular ways of developing content or designing instruction for your students? If yes, please provide specific examples.		X				
13.1.e	**(Faculty)** Is your program designed to apply any principles of effective teaching or teacher preparation? If yes, please identify the parts or places in the program and the foundational research to support the experiences or program design. Please be specific.	X					

Indicator XIV: Does a plan for systematic program (assessment) exist? Based on the responses of the faculty members, this section of Indicator 14 rates a 5, Strong Evidence of Coherency because four or more faculty members can identify specific instances of program assessment in which they have participated in the past five years (other than mandated accreditation revisions). Additionally, each of the faculty members participate on an ongoing basis in the assessment project their department has been conducting over the past seven years. Also, outside evaluators were invited in to assess specific areas of their program, including Murray Mitchell who initiated the first study of

coherency utilizing the generic CAP model. The faculty responses are shown in Table 48.

Table 48

Faculty Responses to Questions Related to Ongoing Program Assessment

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
14.1	Have you ever participated in or are you aware of either an internal audit or an invited external audit (other than as mandated by an accreditation agency) of this program? If yes, please elaborate, who, what, why, and when.	X					5

Based on the responses of the faculty, this section of Indicator 14 rates 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence because at least four faculty members can identify and provide evidence (i.e. contrasting course syllabi, contrasting departmental or college documentation in catalogs or other formal publications) of program revision efforts within the past five years. Indicator XIV averaged score is 5. The rating is shown in Table 49.

Table 49

Faculty Responses to Questions of Program Revision Resulting From Ongoing Assessment

Item Number	Question (Faculty)	5	4	3	2	1	Averaged Rating
14.2	As a result of any form of assessment of this program, whether voluntary or by accreditation mandate, what, if any plans exist for making revisions to this program? Please be specific and provide documentation if available.	X					5

Summary

As is explained within this chapter, multiple aspects of the teacher education program are analyzed for particular outcomes. Based on the responses and/or the documents reviewed, the results were recorded.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Today, teacher education programs are very complex. They draw on many types of courses in programs that are often times numerous. There are a large number of faculty members responsible for delivering the courses to a sometimes-large number of diverse students. Because of such factors, programs sometimes run the risk of losing coherence, which was one of the issues brought up by Howey and Zimpher (1989). In developing coherent programs we are seeking to increase order and control by providing forethought. Coherence in instructional programs is a *means* to general ends and towards developing effective teacher education programs.

This study looked at 14 Indicators of Coherence identified by Howey and Zimpher (1989) in their studies based on effective teacher practices and teacher preparation program assessment. Each of the indicators looked at separate and specific aspects of teacher preparation programs. The forms of data collection were official institutional documents, interviews with faculty, staff, students, and cooperating teachers, and student grade reports. The following discussion is in the numbered order of the Indicators, which were also the Research Questions:

1. Are the teacher preparation programs driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching?

2. Do the faculty appear to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles?
3. Is there a sense of reasonableness and clarity associated with the major goals of the program?
4. Is the program rigorous and academically challenging to the point that students have to work hard to achieve?
5. Do themes run throughout the curriculum like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences?
6. Is there an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge, which can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development?
7. Do student cohort groups exist?
8. At some point in the program, do the cohort groups encounter milestones, benchmarks, or shared ordeals?
9. Do the organizational and structural features of the program enable (allow for) an interdisciplinary or integrated approach to curriculum?
10. Is adequate life space found within the curriculum?
11. Are there adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program?

12. Are there numerous curriculum articulations between activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools?
13. Are there direct linkages with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education?
14. Does a plan for systematic program (assessment) exist?

(Howey & Zimpher, 1989, Adapted with permission)

As suggested by Mitchell (2000), a general "overall" picture can be painted with the help of a scoring system. In this study a five-point rubric was set up for each of the 14 Indicators. Each is separate in itself because each item looked at a different and specific aspect of the teacher education program. Five (5) represented the highest evidence of coherence, 4 was moderate evidence, 3 was low evidence, 2 showed no evidence, and 1 indicated that there was not enough information to make a determination. The experiential background of the researcher mediated the subjectivity of the scoring system. The level of experience and biases of the researcher surely influenced the quality of the final scores. The overall program score does not serve a solo purpose with regard to understanding program coherence. It can, however, serve faculty in the program by helping them compare their program coherence scores over time to discover whether the scores are becoming more or less coherent as changes are introduced. Additionally, if used in conjunction with the Development, Research, and Improvement Model developed by Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998), an HPETE program could and would be able to determine both it's level of effectiveness and level of coherence. Even more useful to the faculty than the summary scores are the numerous insights discovered during the data

collection process. Collecting this information has given the writer in-depth insights into each of the 14 areas studied which informs on a comprehensive level what is important to develop and include in order to build a coherent program.

It was the wish of the Georgia State University (GSU) Health and Physical Education Teacher Education (HPETE) program faculty (2000) "...to look at... (themselves as they)... formulated and implemented the HPETE program over time...(They)... adopted the concept of coherency (Howey & Zimpher, 1989) because it reflected the reality that ...(their)... students would be much less likely to achieve the program's goals if the HPETE faculty did not share, articulate, and operate from a consensus plan" (p. 424). While the work of Howey and Zimpher raised vital issues in teacher education, it gave no concrete direction on how to assess a teacher education program's level of coherency. Since this was the case, the HPETE faculty contacted Murray Mitchell at the University of South Carolina to request that he specifically use the Howey and Zimpher study to develop an assessment protocol to measure coherence in the GSU HPETE program. It was Mitchell's (2000) basic assessment protocol that was utilized to develop the expanded protocol used in this study. His assessment was conducted on the GSU program over the course of two visits in addition to acquiring several institutional documents and other written communications. This assessment plan, like Mitchell's, included interviews with all five full-time HPETE faculty members, two cooperating teachers (CT's) having a minimum of eight years of CT experience with GSU, a staff member, HPETE students, and a comprehensive review of institutional and departmental documents.

Findings

These findings were drawn from Tables 2 through 49 in Chapter V that were developed for the purpose of summarizing the results of this study. Each item in each indicator was rated based on what was discovered. These ratings were utilized to arrive at an average of the low to high score for each sub-item in that indicator. The lowest and highest rating of the items in each indicator were identified as well.

Indicator I: Are the teacher preparation programs driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching?

Based on the information gathered in Indicator I, the following was discovered: The faculty felt that the main purposes of schools were multifaceted. The main functions of teachers were to facilitate student learning/inquiry and to be a model of the same. They indicated that the main purposes of schools, main function(s) of teachers in P-12 schools, and the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in P-12 schools were communicated to the HPETE students in the following courses; KH-2130-Physical Education Programming, KH 3200-Instructional Skills for Health and Physical Education, and the Curriculum Block (KH-4510, 4520, 4530, 4540, and 3660).

All of the major course syllabi were individually assessed (23 courses), for coordinated consistencies between course objectives, learning experiences, course assignments, and the evaluation criteria. Of the 23 courses, 10 matched across these areas, 11 did not have enough information to make a determination, and 2 contained too little information to make any comparison/determination.

When the students were asked to review the course syllabi of the courses they had taken and to identify any differences in what was indicated and their actual experiences in the courses, all responses scored a 4, which translates to mean a moderate level of coherence.

The staff interview summary score was a 3 out of 5. While the staff member could identify and direct students to the faculty members they needed to see, to the designated equipment rooms, and on procedures for equipment accessibility, in-depth knowledge of the HPETE program was not evident.

When addressing the Cooperating Teacher's (CT's), their responses were consistent. Their responses were also consistent in explaining the main purposes of schools, the main function(s) of teachers in P-12 schools, and the fundamental purpose(s) of Physical Education in P-12 schools.

Across all subcategories of Indicator I, the average score was 3.7 with a low of 1 and a high of 5. This indicates that the faculty were somewhat consistent in their responses to the questions for this indicator and Indicator I receives a rating of 3.7 = Low to Moderate Evidence of Coherence.

Indicator II: Do the faculty members appear to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles?

There was a clearly defined group of full-time faculty responsible for the design and delivery of the teacher preparation program and all of the faculty discuss and agree upon course syllabi content. Additionally, faculty input to course content was regularly

sought, the program is improving and faculty would be willing to have their own children be taught by graduates of this program.

The CT's responses were in agreement and consistent. They have worked with the student teachers from this institution up to now and before the past 5 years and they agree that the graduates have improved considerably over this time period. They agreed that the student teachers would be excellent teachers for their own children. As a result, across all sub-categories of Indicator II, the average score was 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherence, with both respondents rating a 5.

Indicator III: Is there a sense of reasonableness and clarity associated with the major goals of the program?

While the faculty could identify that they were knowledgeable of and fully aware of the goals of the HPETE program, no copies were immediately accessible. They knew where to find them, and could identify them. As a group, they were unable to state the goals from memory, however they agreed that the goals made sense, were realistic and achievable, and could identify where the goals were addressed in the program when a written copy was utilized.

In reviewing the course descriptions from the University catalog, though it is not explicitly stated, generalized assumptions could be made that the goals of the program would be met.

When the CT's were addressed regarding their knowledge of the major goals and objectives of the HPETE program at GSU, they unanimously responded that they were

familiar with the major goals and objectives, they made sense to them, and were not just senseless rhetoric.

As a result, across all subcategories of Indicator III, the average score was a 4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherence with a low of 3 and a high of 5.

Indicator IV: Is the program rigorous and academically challenging to the point that students have to work hard to achieve?

Upon review of official institutional and program documents, it was found that program guidelines for retention, graduation, and teacher certification were the same as the institutional minimums. However, for entry into the HPE program, the HPETE program requires a 2.7 grade point average (GPA) where the institutional requirement is a 2.5 GPA. These guidelines were published in a formal institutional document that was readily accessible to prospective and current students. Course grading policies reflected higher achievement levels than the minimum competency requirements and course grades reflected a range of grades received beyond all A's.

The results of student interviews indicated that they were able to identify specific parts of the program that challenged them intellectually and/or emotionally and not just from a "stamina" perspective.

As a result of these findings, across all subcategories of Indicator IV, the average score was a 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency.

Indicator V: Do themes run throughout the curriculum like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences?

Based on a review of program documents, goals were clearly identified. Faculty members were able to clearly articulate how treatment of concepts were different in different courses, i.e., introductory treatment early in the program through application and refinement later in the program. Course assignments that were reviewed reflect differential treatment of similar concepts across courses and students were able to confirm this differential treatment.

Responses from CT's indicated that supervising teachers communicated with them to discover what they taught and the types of experiences they provided the student teachers. Additionally, the supervising teachers shared with the cooperating teachers what their students needed from their student teaching experience and obtained feedback from them on their views, and welcomed any suggested modifications that may be needed to improve the performance of their students.

As a result of these findings, across all subcategories of Indicator V, the average score was a 5 = Strong Evidence of Coherency which was the score for all respondents.

Indicator VI: There is an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge that can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development.

Based on the research done in this study at GSU, the connection between General Education courses and that of major programs was little to none. The faculty in the HPETE program could describe minimal attempts to communicate with faculty teaching

General Education Courses. No examples were cited on how concepts were linked across all three areas (general, pedagogical, experiential) in the curriculum.

Students, however, were able to make content knowledge connections between earlier program course content and that which came later. Only a few examples were cited and somewhat consistent across students. Course syllabi did not confirm the connections addressed in responses from students and faculty. Thus, across all subcategories of Indicator VI, the average score was 3 = Low Evidence of Coherency with a low of 3 and a high of 5.

Indicator VII: Student cohort groups exist.

Upon review of student rosters from major courses, it was possible to identify students that appeared to form cohorts across three or more semesters/quarters within the program. Also the students could identify other students that formed their cohort within the program.

Each faculty member in the program was able to identify the typical placement of major courses within the program. Thus as a result, across all subcategories of Indicator VII, the average score was 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency which was the same for all respondents.

Indicator VIII: At some point in the program, cohorts encounter a milestone or benchmark or shared ordeal.

Each of the students consistently identified a part of the program that was essentially challenging. Students identified numerous opportunities before graduation in which they were able to decipher whether they felt confident of their career choice, and

were knowledgeable of how their program was noticeably different from other teacher preparation programs.

Additionally, faculty members were able to identify a course/set of courses, or a set of experiences that represented challenges that were not only somewhat unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other programs might get, but were also unique to what other HPETE programs in other parts of the state or country offer.

Thus, across all the subcategories of Indicator VIII, the average score was 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherence which was the same for all respondents.

Indicator IX: Organizational and structural features of the program enable an interdisciplinary or integrative approach to curriculum.

Students and faculty were able to identify courses where HPETE students were enrolled with students from other teaching tracks and other disciplines. Also, only one student was able to specifically identify at least two concepts that were covered in general education courses and in physical education courses; the student could provide specific examples for how he/she could link the topics in their own teaching. Additionally, only one or two of the faculty members could describe communications with general education faculty to provide insights into how physical education and other disciplines might overlap. Thus, across all subcategories of Indicator IX, the average score was 4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency with a low of 3 and a high of 5.

Indicator X: Adequate life space is found within the curriculum.

More than two students and at least two faculty members were aware of and could identify specific students who had taken different routes to initial certification (i.e., taking different courses, time frames, or course sequences).

More than four students could identify more than two concepts that they addressed in different ways across at least two major courses, one being early in the program and the other being later in the program.

As a result, across all subcategories of Indicator X, the average score was 4.5, rounded up to 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherency with a low of 4 and a high of 5.

Indicator XI: There are adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, and information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program.

More than four students were able to identify more than two specific alternatives for accessing help they may need from faculty members or past course materials relating to curriculum content, instructional approaches and/or resources available to them through the department. Also, more than four students were able to identify specific instructional materials (i.e., videos, computer programs, and overhead projectors) and the means to use the materials from the department for an instructional assignment. Furthermore, more than four students were able to identify at least two specific students that had actually used the materials in an instructional assignment. Thus, across all subcategories of Indicator XI the average score was 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherence, which was the same for all respondents.

Indicator XII: There are numerous curriculum articulations between the activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools.

More than four students were able to provide more than two specific examples each of instances where topics addressed in theory-based courses had been applied in practicum situations. More than two students were able to provide more than two specific examples of opportunities to design and deliver instruction to "real" pupils. Also, the CT's and the faculty members consistently identified more than two types of knowledge and skills that they expect university students to bring to the praticum experience. These expectations reflect thoughtful considerations rather than ideas generated as a result of this question. Thus, across all subcategories of Indicator XII, the average score was 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherence with a low of 3 and a high of 5.

Indicator XIII: There is some direct linkage with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education.

Two or more students and two or more faculty members could identify specific instances of involvement with ongoing research projects, and could link names of at least two different researchers with specific insights into curriculum and/or instructional practices in teaching and/or teacher education in physical education. Thus, across all subcategories of Indicator XIII, the average score was 4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherence with a low of 4 and a high of 5.

Indicator XIV: A plan for systematic program (assessment) exists.

Four or more faculty members could identify and provide evidence (i.e. contrasting course syllabi, contrasting departmental or college documentation in catalogs or other formal publications) of specific instances of program assessment in which they had participated within the past five years (other than mandated accreditation reviews). Thus, across all subcategories of Indicator XIV, the average score was 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency which was the score for all respondents.

Conclusions

The acquisition of knowledge gained from this study was invaluable. If programs of Teacher Education would utilize this protocol to assess the levels of coherency in their particular institutions, they would uncover valuable amounts of information that would guide them toward coherently effective programs.

Not only is it important for the administration, faculty and staff to understand the components of a teacher preparation program, but the students are of utmost importance in the existence and operation of programs. It is critical that they understand the careers they are preparing to pursue, what the expectations of that career are, who is delivering that information and providing the experiences in which they are to partake, and the cohesiveness of the unit. So it is equally important for them to be informed across all aspects of the program in which they are active participants.

The conclusions drawn are discussed by Indicator for clarity in understanding, and then a summary follows.

As Howey and Zimpher (1989) suggested, "Thoughtful conceptions grounded in theory, research, and practice can:

a. contribute to shared beliefs, faculty collegiality, and ongoing program renewal;
b. contribute to considerations of curriculum *scope, sequence, integration,* and *articulation;*
c. contribute clearly to what is valued in a teacher and what is expected of the prospective teacher;
d. contribute to a shared sense of reasonableness for what would be expected of a prospective teacher by identifying a limited number of core dispositional behaviors which emanate from the conception(s);
e. contribute to more realistic role definitions for teachers through conceptions of teaching that fully acknowledge the realities of schools as a workplace; and
f. contribute to an explicit, coherent design for programmatic research and evaluation." (p. 246)

With these items in mind, the following conclusions have been drawn:

In **Indicator I** the objective was to look at whether the program was driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching. The responses of the major stakeholders, namely the faculty, staff, students and the cooperating teachers (CT's), were varied. While the faculty and the cooperating teachers were consistent in their responses, the staff person and the students were not. It must be noted that the semester in which the

interviews were done was a period in which program transitions were being made. Students responded that too many activities in the course outline/schedule were changed and altered, which for him/her, made the program seem "disorganized." From a faculty standpoint, it is understood that sometimes adjustments need to be made, and possibly, the student did not understand this as part of what sometimes happens in what he/she termed to be "real world school situations." The staff person was not fully knowledgeable about the program, and based on responsibilities/job description for that position, it may not have been necessary. So, again, many factors play into these subjective/interpretive conclusions, even with the solid responses given by the respondents.

It became quite obvious that the faculty worked very closely in not only the development of the philosophical base, the conceptual framework, and the program planning, but each one was also aware of the program theme, goals and objectives. The only exception to this observation was one faculty member that was new to the program at the time the interviews were conducted. The CT's were aware of the program and its expectations, but the clarity needs to be extended to the students, whose outcome-measures at the time they exit the program will represent the total impact of the major program.

Another aspect of major importance was the impact, or lack thereof, of additional necessary connections to the major goals of the program between the Science courses and the Practicum/Block courses. The evidence that led to this conclusion was the lack of comprehensiveness or clarity in the course syllabi to tie course goals and objectives,

assignments, student expectations, learning experiences, and evaluation criteria together. In addition, the students were unable to respond with some impressionable level of consistency to the same bank of questions asked of the faculty related to this indicator. What made this so plain to see is the fact that all of the practicum/curriculum and instruction, student teaching and seminar courses were all in compliance with the course syllabi areas addressed. This makes it evident where the concentration of work has been and informs the program of where it may need to concentrate its efforts next.

Indicator II looked at whether the faculty members coalesce around experimental programs that have *distinctive* qualities and specific *symbolic* titles, (in a particular focus area in Physical Education). The HPETE program at GSU was a perfect example of this type of program in that it was completely rewritten based on the guiding principles of the National Association of Sports and Physical Education's National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers. (These were explained in an earlier section of this study.) The faculty developed the program collegially, including curriculum scope, sequence, integration and articulation. This is evident by the cohesiveness of the practicum course(s), curriculum and instruction, student teaching and seminar courses. These courses not only interrelated, but they touched on all 9 of the Beginning Teacher Standards on which the program was built. The faculty members in the HPETE program had shared interests in research and published their findings, team-taught various courses in the curriculum, and collaborated extensively in conducting the operations of the program. Their individual input was sought in their specialized areas on a regular basis.

And, based on their confidence in their program, they also responded that they would be more than proud to have their own children be taught by their graduating majors.

The cooperating teachers that worked with the HPETE program at GSU were equally confident and tied into the program. Their input was sought and they communicated regularly with the HPETE supervising teachers. Unique to this program was the fact that each of the full-time faculty members participated in the curriculum block classes and treated it as a shared responsibility by acting as supervising teachers to each of the student teachers each semester. This afforded the students an opportunity to have comprehensive review coverage of their teaching skills by each of the faculty members from which they had taken major courses. Thus, it was evident why the program rated a 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherence for Indicator II.

In **Indicator III** we were seeking to find out if a sense of reasonableness and clarity were associated with the major goals of the program. While the faculty members were unable to actually put their hands on a copy of the major goals and objectives of the program, they each indicated that they knew where they were and how they guided the program. At the time of the faculty interviews the formal written mission and philosophy statement had not been finalized. This was due to the recent re-orchestration of the HPETE program, however there was no doubt that they were all familiar with the direction their program was taking. As was found in the study by Howey and Zimpher (1989), the consensus of the faculty regarding the priorities of the program permitted the review of key concepts in many of the major courses and other experiences structured for the students. It was also clarified in the faculty and CT interviews that as a result of their

move towards a model's based approach for teaching that the students are expected to, and have attained, recognizable levels of proficiency in these teaching approaches. They are being trained how to teach any content that they might have to teach. They are immersed into active participation of teaching in the schools early on in the program. This contributes to the students getting early exposure to help them make important decisions about whether teaching is the career they truly want to pursue.

One additional step was taken to asses this indicator and that was to look at the major course syllabi to determine if the major goals of the HPETE program were actually present and embedded in the course outlines. The results of this were that the science courses addressed only the knowledge base, while the other major courses addressed anywhere from three to all nine of the major program goals. This information can be found in Appendix B.

In **Indicator IV** we were seeking to determine if the program was rigorous and academically challenging to the point that students had to work hard to achieve. We looked first at their required GPA's for entry into, retention, and graduation from the HPETE program. While the entry grade point average into the program was higher than the stated institutional grade point average, it was expected that the students would retain a minimum GPA of 2.5 since all major courses must be passed with a minimum of a grade of 'C'. Thus, by requiring a 2.7, they would have a little leverage in case they actually earned any C's during the time they were completing their program course requirements. While the minimum GPA for graduation from the institution is 2.0, having to retain the 2.5 prior to student teaching and having to earn a minimum of a 'C' in

student teaching substantiates that the graduates from the program would not likely drop below the required institutional GPA minimum.

When the grades of 100 random sample students across six years were reviewed, the concluding results for major courses taken by students in the program and other related KH courses between 1996 and 2002, it was found that the HPETE major students maintained high levels of achievement across all 25 major courses. Approximately 14% percent of the students earned A's and C's respectively in the major courses while 72% percent of the students earned in the range of high to low B's. This again reflects that the students are not only encouraged, but also expected to maintain high standards of achievement in the HPETE major program. Statistical data can be found in Appendix F.

In student responses to the question of whether the HPETE program was challenging to them, they almost unanimously agreed that the "block" classes were the most challenging. The other two areas were Biomechanics, because of its focus on Sports Science materials and the Praxis Math test because math was a difficult area for the student interviewed. Passing of the Praxis I tests are part of the entry requirements into any teacher education program. As a result, Indicator IV scored a 5 for Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

Indicator V focused on the question of whether or not themes ran throughout the curriculum like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, were tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences.

The results showed that since the faculty members conducted regular ongoing assessments of their program, they were made aware of needed changes or adaptations to

the program on a regular basis. It became evident from the responses of the faculty, students, and the cooperating teachers that themes ran throughout the curriculum and were tied together throughout the KH 3000, KH 3200, and the curriculum "block" courses. This was also made evident in the search for major program goal coverage/ inclusion (NASPE Standards) in these same courses.

Howey and Zimpher (1989) suggested that it was critical, as did Henrietta Barnes (1987) that a program's theme "is probably important, and perhaps only, if the program's also structured to help students develop schemata of teaching that are complete, well-organized, and stable" (p. 15). Most program developers would agree that these are characteristics they would want their programs to demonstrate. For the GSU HPETE program, a major theme was the use of multiple teaching models that facilitate the teaching of any physical education subject matter. The faculty and cooperating teacher interview responses concurred that while a lot is expected of its students, they also gave a lot to help the students develop into competent beginning teachers. Though the students were repeatedly drilled in the techniques of the teaching models, it was not projected that they would perfect them during their matriculation, however they would be adequately skilled to continue practicing them independently.

In **Indicator VI** the intent was to determine if there was a balance between general knowledge, which could be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development. The first area looked at whether knowledge gained in general education required courses was somehow reinforced in a methods course and/or practicum experience. They identified that there

was some carry over from the areas of Math, into the Measurement and Evaluation course and History, for background study in the area of their specialization, Health and Physical Education.

When the HPETE faculty members were asked if they had inquired with general education faculty to discover what was taught or to identify what they wanted their students to gain from those courses, three of the five major program faculty members responded that they had not communicated with general education instructors who typically taught courses that teacher preparation students took. One faculty member was involved in Freshman Orientation seminars and was able to communicate directly to students through those courses that he/she conducted. Another one communicated with the person who taught Nutrition and Health and discussed an assignment that was part of the course and was also part of the Training and Fitness course, to ensure that there was no duplication of assignments. However, there was agreement that the Core courses were much too "general" in nature, were taught by a multitude of instructors of the core curriculum, and felt that there was almost no carry-over.

In contrast to this, upon interviewing the Chair of the Educational Policy Studies division, it was stated that he/she, as a professor in that division, would welcome input from the faculty in specialized areas. This would allow them to relate the course materials to the students so that the content knowledge would be more meaningful to them within their given fields. While this might seem like a monumental task, it is achievable one course at a time with the assistance of a liaison professor from each specialized area.

To facilitate the acquisition of pedagogical knowledge and its development, both the faculty and the cooperating teachers identified the same courses through which this is achieved: KH 3200, KH 3040, KH 3050, KH 3660, KH 4510, KH 4520, KH 4530, KH 4540, KH 4660, and KH 4700. In addition, the supervising teachers made site visits to the schools before the student teachers started to teach to make sure that everyone was on the same path for the eight weeks of each practicum experience.

Student responses to this question of pedagogical knowledge and its development were consistent in that they were able to identify the same courses and the prescribed knowledge base described by the faculty and cooperating teachers.

In addressing the question of the integration of concepts from General Education Core required courses into the professional core, KH 3010, KH 3200, and KH 4510 were identified as where this takes place. Integration of knowledge from within the HPETE program draws from KH 3020, 3030, 3040, 3050 and KH 4520 into the "block" classes for knowledge base application. As a result, this area rated a 3, Low Evidence of Coherence because of the continued difficulty to integrate General Education content with major program content to date.

Indicator VII questioned the existence of cohort groups within the program. In review of official institutional course enrollment lists, it was found that the same names appeared on courses sequenced across time. Exceptions were explained to be the result of a few students being returning students for certification purposes, thus some of the courses they had already completed during a prior enrollment period.

Students were asked if they could identify other students that were in the same courses across time and unanimously responded that this was evident.

This indicator further sought to discover if faculty members were truly knowledgeable of their program by examining their knowledge of the sequential offering of courses within their discipline. They were found to be very knowledgeable, including being familiar with the exceptions to the planned program sequencing. This indicator received a rating of 5, Very High Evidence of Coherency.

Indicator VIII questioned whether the cohort groups encountered milestones, benchmarks, or shared ordeals during their matriculation. Both the faculty members and the students consistently responded that the program's major benchmarks were the block courses.

The faculty members were asked if the program offered something that was somewhat unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get. Also, they were asked if the program was unique or different from HPETE programs in other parts of the state or country. The unanimous response revealed that the GSU HPETE program was different in that they train students to teach in P-12 settings while other teacher education programs train for elementary, middle, or high school settings as separate entities. The program was unique because the students at GSU were put into the field much earlier than most other programs because it was primarily field based. This was different because most programs presented content in the classroom and then students didn't usually have immediate access to apply the knowledge. In the GSU

program the students go out into the field for most content classes. Thus, based on these conclusions, this indicator received a rating of 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

Indicator IX sought to determine if the organizational and structural features of the program allowed for an interdisciplinary or integrated approach to curriculum. What was concluded was that both faculty members and students were aware of those students who were in the same or different career tracks, and could identify which other courses they would encounter students majoring in different career tracks. In response to the inquiry of whether information covered in General Education Core classes carried over into the major courses, language arts, math, science, and history were the only areas mentioned. Language arts and math were integrated into Rhythms and Movement, while Biology was integrated into the Cardiopulmonary discussion(s) in courses and history was primarily used in discussions about the various sports being taught.

When asked if any topics covered in Physical Education courses had been covered by instructors in other courses, the resounding response was no. When HPETE faculty were asked if General Education faculty had communicated with them to ask what their majors needed from the GE core, the responses was also no. The result here was that there was minimal if any tying together of the General Education Core classes to any given major program. As of 2000, accrediting agencies, in particular NCATE, decided to start mandating that this start happening in colleges of teacher education. Many 4-year or 5-year teacher preparation programs are suffering now because some students don't see how the first two years of their college education ties to their career choices. Additionally in Georgia, and it is spreading throughout the United States, is the fact that State

Education Agencies are developing mini-study programs to certify teachers to teach in our schools, due to the great shortage of teachers. College students then ask, so why are we "wasting our time here" when all we have to do is attend that program for 6 weeks to become a teacher. And why should we bother with 4 years of education instead of 6 weeks followed by paid on-the-job-training, which would then lead us to taking the teacher certification test without "wasting" four years of our time? As a result, this indicator earned a rating of 4, Moderate Evidence of Coherency.

Indicator X examines whether there is adequate life space found within the curriculum. It took some creative maneuvering of courses and content in order to make sure that students acquired the broad knowledge base necessary in a P-12 program. The program was so multifaceted that it had to make sure that the knowledge base was fully covered. Then, on top of that, teaching this knowledge base to three different school levels and making it age/stage appropriate added more to the picture. When faced with the limitation of hours you can expect students to take and you must give up almost half of those hours to General Education Core requirements, it makes it very difficult and necessary to condense the requirements in the major as creatively as possible. The HPETE faculty at GSU did just that. A few areas to mention are where many programs would require First Aid and CPR, students are required to take that on their own, not counting it as major hours. Swimming competence is not required here, just evidence that they are able to participate in water rescue and extraction problems. There was no room for electives in the program since the hours were stretched to the limit with requirements.

In this indicator, we also looked at whether concepts covered in the early part of the program were revisited in courses later in the program. There was a resounding yes for the courses taken in the major. The resulting rating for this indicator was a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

Indicator XI sought to identify if there were adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program. The students had access to all books they utilized within their program. They were instructed to keep them for continued use throughout their matriculation. Instructional resources were available through the department and/or University Media Resources. Equipment was adequately supplied which was confirmed via the development of an inventory control list completed by the researcher and submitted to the department. Information and communication technologies were available through the Kinesiology and Health (KH) department as well as through the numerous GSU computer labs open to all GSU students for extended hours seven days per week during any given semester. Because there is a Biomechanics major, a Sports Science major and a Cardiac Rehabilitation concentration, the students have more than adequate access to the various laboratories needed within the program. There is also a Fitness Laboratory in which they coach other students in fitness assessment and development. This aspect of Indicator XI rated a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

In addition, this indicator went a step further to determine if the students were aware of the instructional materials/assistance accessible to them, how to access it, and if indeed, they had taken advantage of any opportunities to do so. Most of the students

interviewed were aware of the instructional materials and/or assistance available to them within the department, and GSU at large, however, they had only taken advantage of the opportunities to use instructional equipment, but not audiovisual or computerized equipment. Thus, this averaged score was 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

Indicator XII questioned whether there were numerous curriculum articulations between activities that occurred on campus and those activities that occurred in schools. This was where the uniqueness of this particular program stands strong. Because the clinical, practicum, and curriculum courses all occurred in the field, articulation is evident on a continuum. Students communicate both with the cooperating teachers and supervising teachers simultaneously. Thus, those concepts brought to the forefront by either the university professors (supervising teachers) or the cooperating teachers, were reinforced by each other. They were learning in "real" situations in real schools with students; thus the realities of the pedagogy they have learned are either substantiated or not right away, since direct application of methodologies is immediate. This is an important place to interject what Buchmann and Floden (1990) use as descriptors of coherence. They talk about the descriptive interpretations of coherence, of it stressing "connection," "harmony," and "wholeness." Because of the structure of the GSU HPETE program, it models these descriptors:

> Enhancing order, continuity, and the compatibility of parts in a pattern, "coherence" would seem to lessen the chance that ideas and experiences decompose into disparate, meaningless bits, their worth and formative power eroded accordingly. (p. 8)

Because the pedagogical parts are so connected and unified, the many "parts" come together due to the design and intent of the program itself. The "meaningless bits" occur in programs where there are no "connections" between the faculty and between the multiple component parts of a program! Thus, the rating for this indicator was a 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

Indicator XIII looked for direct linkages with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education. Both faculty members and students were interviewed for this item. The faculty indicated that they did not involve undergraduate students in research projects beyond asking them to participate as subjects. They taught research methodology, informed students of their own research, and actually incorporated their acquired knowledge into the major program. They utilized texts that they themselves had written, in addition to many texts written by other noted authors/researchers in the field. The students indicated that they were aware of the fact that their professors had written a few of the texts they used and were proud to be using them, and to be in a program with leading teaching professionals in the field. They were also proud of the fact that their program was part of a major Assessment Project study that was being conducted by their professors. They acknowledged their acceptance and participation. The averaged score for this indicator was 4, Moderate Evidence of Coherence.

Indicator XIV looked at whether there was a plan for systematic program assessment. Again, this was an area in which the GSU HPETE program rated 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence. When they rewrote the HPETE program, they began a

longitudinal study to measure the effectiveness of the new program in comparison to the old program. They wrote for and were given grants from both their professional association as well as their institution, to conduct a comprehensive restructuring and Assessment Project on their program. The initial results of that project were published in the Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, v 19, No. 4, July 2000. The assessment was very extensive and comprehensive. The comprehensiveness of their research component makes the program highly commendable and visible. Ongoing formative assessments help keep the program current and "up-to-date." This makes for an excellent recruiting tool for persons interested in research in the area of teacher education. It is a model program not only for physical education professionals, but also for teacher education programs in general. Thus, the averaged score for Indicator XIV is 5, Very Strong Evidence of Coherence.

Implications

The HPETE program at GSU was designed based on the current paradigm of Health and Physical Education Teacher Education Programs. The document guiding its developed was the National Association of Sports and Physical Education Beginning Teacher Standards. This took their program to the next level, which would be evident to anyone who simply looks at the results of this coherency assessment. While this type of an assessment could not stand alone, it gives a tremendous amount of valuable knowledge to the department or program being assessed. The entry requirements are slightly higher than the institutional minimums. Students are quickly immersed into teaching from the

beginning to the end of the program. The GSU HPETE program has a graduation rate of 97 %. Since the Georgia Teacher Certification Test ended and the Praxis I and II tests began, GSU HPETE students have demonstrated a Praxis II passing rate of 75% on the first try and 97% by second attempt. The entire full-time faculty 'bought into' the program's development, implementation, and evaluation. They have sought outside assessments to complement what they themselves have done. It stands to reason, that if other programs of teacher education would take the steps needed as a program, "buy into" a plan for program improvement, and possibly utilize the protocol suggested in this study to test their level(s) of coherence, they could be on their way to a more unified, well-informed, discipline focused, and research based teacher education program.

The Coherency Assessment piece of the GSU HPETE program's Assessment Project was just that, a piece in the Development, Research, Improvement Model designed by Metzler and Tjeerdsma (1998). Its purpose was strictly to inform the program of its strengths, weaknesses, and specific areas of need where changes were necessary for the purpose of ongoing program improvement.

Because this study was an extension of a prior but less comprehensive study which was done by Murray Mitchell (2000), the researcher thought it to be important to make mention of the results by comparing and contrasting Mitchell's study and this study. There are many implications that can or should be looked at. The interviews that Mitchell did and the one's done by this researcher were done in two subsequent semesters. While the faculty members were the same, the students did change. All other factors basically remained the same.

First, Figure 2 shows the results of Mitchell's Program Coherency Self Assessment Summary Scores and those of this study. The findings of Mitchell and Hampton for each indicator are summarized in Table 50.

Mitchell (2000)			Hampton (2002)	
Coherence Indicator	Score	⟺	Coherence Indicator	Score
1	3 Strong		1	4 Moderate
2	3 Strong		2	5 Strong
3	3 Strong		3	4 Moderate
4	2 Medium		4	4 Moderate
5	3 Strong		5	5 Strong
6	1 Low		6	3 Low
7	3 Strong	⟺	7	5 Strong
8	3 Strong		8	5 Strong
9	1 Low		9	4 Moderate
10	3 Strong		10	4 Moderate
11	3 Strong		11	4 Moderate
12	2 Medium		12	4 Moderate
13	2 Medium		13	4 Moderate
14	3 Strong		14	5 Strong
Total	35 (83%)		Total	60 (85.7%)
Note: Each coherence indicator is scored out of a possible 3 points; a higher score reflects more coherence. The percentage is based on a total of 42 possible points.		⟺	*Note:* Each coherence indicator is scored out of a possible 5 points; a higher score reflects more coherence. The percentage is based on a total of 70 possible points	

Figure 2. Coherency Assessment Comparison

Table 50

Findings of Mitchell and Hampton for Each Indicator

Indicator I: Are teacher preparation programs driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching?	
Findings of Mitchell (1997)	Findings of Hampton (2000)
• Views of the purposes of schools and roles of teachers: not uniform. • Educating the whole person and preparing for the future was a common remark. • Faculty and students used similar language to describe the levels of PE • Few could point out where in the program students learned about teachers and schools.	• Views of the purposes of schools and roles of teachers: not uniform • Preparing students to be come independent learners was a common remark. • Faculty and Students used common language to differentiate the levels of PE • Four of the five faculty members were able to identify where students learned about teachers and schools.
Indicator II: Do the faculty members appear to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles?	
Findings of Mitchell (1997)	Findings of Hampton (2000)
• Faculty readily identify themselves as a group with shared interests and responsibilities. • Faculty felt that regardless of the program teacher, students would get similar experiences. • Decisions regarding program revisions are shared between the faculty and there is a clear sense of ownership of these decisions.	• Faculty members work closely with colleagues in the program, share course development within their areas of expertise, and sometimes even team-teach. • Faculty members agreed that they could teach courses across the program with similar student outcomes. • Programmatic decisions are shared as well as their implementation.

Table 50 (continued)

Indicator III: Is there a sense of reasonableness and clarity associated with the major goals of the program?	
Findings of Mitchell (1997)	Findings of Hampton (2000)
• Major course syllabi reviewed for inclusion of major program goals. None were addressed by name in any of the course documentation.	• Major course syllabi reviewed for inclusion of major program goals. None were addressed by name in any of the course documentation, however evidence of their presence in the practicum, block and student teaching courses was evident.
• Neither cooperating teacher named the program goals, nor from where they originated.	• Neither cooperating teacher could identify the major program goals, nor their origin.
• NASPE Standards were utilized to redesign the program. Standards 1,2,and 8 clearly addressed in the program. Uneven support for standards 4,5,6,7, and 9. No evidence found to support Standard 3.	• NASPE Standards basis for program redesign. All 9 standards, though not identified by number, were evident upon review of official program documentation. Appendix B shows this coverage.
Indicator IV: Is the program rigorous and academically challenging to the point that students have to work hard to achieve?	
Findings of Mitchell (1997)	Findings of Hampton (2000)
• Guidelines for entry, retention and graduation are above institutional minimums.	• Guidelines for entry, retention and graduation are above institutional minimums.
• Students at different stages within the program held different perceptions about challenging experiences in the program.	• Students at different stages in the program held different opinions about what they thought to be challenging.
• Grades received by students in the science courses reflect mean grades below "B". Activity content courses and methods	• Grades received by students in the science courses reflect grades of mostly "C's", the minimum acceptable. Activity content

Table 50 (continued)

courses reflect a much higher mean for student grades.	courses and pedagogical courses reflect much higher student letter grades.

Indicator V: Do themes run throughout the curriculum like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences?

Findings of Mitchell (1997)	Findings of Hampton (2000)
• Instructional Models theme strong.	• Instructional Models Theme prevalent.
• Content development occurred strongly throughout the program.	• Knowledge gained throughout the program was taught based on the teaching models reinforced in each course for application of teaching skills.
• Students make clear connections across courses within the program.	• Connections of concepts and methodologies are strongly evident across courses.

Indicator VI: Is there an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge, which can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development?

Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• One faculty member described interactions with other faculty outside of the department regarding curricular connections.	• Two faculty members described interactions with other faculty outside of the department regarding curricular connections.
• Students interviewed expressed concerns with the relevance of foundational courses.	• Students were concerned about multiple changes being made to a course during the semester. (Resulting from the program being in transition).

Table 50 (continued)

Indicator VII: Do student cohort groups exist?	
Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• Student cohort groups are clearly present in the GSU program.	• Evidence of student cohort groups is present in the GSU program.
Indicator VIII: At some point in the program, do the cohort groups encounter milestones, benchmarks, or shared ordeals?	
Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• Milestone consistently mentioned by students was the course in Biomechanics. • "The block" classes were also mentioned as a milestone on the path toward student teaching and certification.	• Milestones identified by students in this program were Biomechanics and Math. • "The block" classes was the other milestone students considered to be necessarily challenging.
Indicator IX: Do the organizational and structural features of the program enable (allow for) an interdisciplinary or integrated approach to curriculum?	
Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• Faculty only showed passing familiarity with courses required of their students but were taught outside the department. Students could identify these courses, but the courses were considered to be tangential to their physical education curriculum and instructional concerns.	• Faculty members were familiar with the courses students were required to take but were taught outside the department, however, not much emphasis was identified or placed upon embedding the NASPE Standards, (the major program goals), into those courses.

Table 50 (continued)

Indicator X: Is adequate life space found within the curriculum?	
Findings of Mitchell (200)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• There is a planned program with sequentially ordered courses. There are no possibilities for "shortcuts", or alternatives to graduation/certification.	• There is a planned program and courses are sequentially ordered. No "shortcuts" are possible, alternatives to graduation/certification are nil.
• Students are closely monitored for compliance with program expectations.	• One faculty member is charged with monitoring students closely for compliance with program expectations. This reduces enrollment mistakes.
• Students were satisfied with their ability to have personal lives and still be able to excel in the program.	• Students felt they had personal lives and were still be able to complete the planned program.
Indicator XI: Are there adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program?	
Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• Students consistently identified the availability of curriculum materials, instructional resources, and information and communication technologies.	• Curriculum materials, instructional resources, and information and communication technologies were readily available to the students.
• Modeling the use of technology was more heavily emphasized in health than in the physical education portion of the curriculum.	• Technology applications were extensively utilized in the health curriculum.
• Course descriptions, faculty descriptions, and student accounts of the revised program suggest the laboratory exponent of the program had changed.	• Course descriptions, faculty responses, and student accounts of the revised program strongly emphasized the changed, more effective, practicum experiences.

Table 50 (continued)

• Students reported confidence in their ability to work with learners resulting from having had more demanding practicum experiences with real children, (not just peers) in real schools.	• Students described a high level of confidence in their abilities to work with young students because they had more demanding practicum experiences with real children (not just peers) in real schools than prior program graduates.
• Students reported confidence in their accessibility to faculty as resources.	• Students responded that they knew faculty members were accessible to them,
Indicator XII: Are there numerous curriculum articulations between activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools?	
Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• Demands made of students, according to course syllabi and as evidenced on sample lesson plans, were demonstrated and showed that theory was reinforced in methods courses.	• Demands made of students in the course syllabi and evidenced on sample lesson plans, demonstrated that theory was reinforced in methods courses.
• Creating lesson plans, designing instructional materials, and developing the content of lessons for learners were all concepts addressed in theory and in practice.	• Creating lesson plans, designing instructional materials, and developing the content of lessons for learners were addressed in theory and in practice.
• Consistency between what was demanded of students in the program and what teachers in the schools modeled was not noted.	• Consistency between what was demanded of students in the program and what teachers modeled in the schools, was not evident.
• Students identified that teachers in the schools were not planning as extensively as they were being taught to plan.	• Students identified that teachers in the schools were not planning as extensively as they were being taught to plan.

Indicator XIII: Are there direct linkages with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education?	
Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• Student awareness of ongoing research projects and researchers was vague. • Students were not "actively" aware they were participants in the GSU Assessment Project study. • No students reported opportunities to do more than participate in studies (i.e., to be subject).	• Student awareness of ongoing research projects was clear, since they were the subjects. • Students were fully aware that they were participants in the GSU Assessment Project study. • There was no evidence to show where any students were given opportunities to do more than be a participant in studies (i.e., to be a participant).
Indicator XIV: Does a plan for systematic program assessment exist?	
Findings of Mitchell (2000)	Findings of Hampton (2001)
• The program has an ongoing self-imposed self-analysis in addition to two separate invited analyses from colleagues at other institutions (Mitchell & McCullick, 2000).	• The program is conducting an ongoing self-created self-analysis in addition to two separate invited analyses from colleagues at other institutions (Mitchell & McCullick, 2000).

Recommendations

Extensive advancements have occurred over the years in the quest towards excellence in the planning, operation, and outcomes of teacher education programs. All of the major stakeholders play important roles in its success or failure. This being true, one suggestion for the faculty to consider is possibly inviting graduates back to campus to

partake in periodic discussions during their first year of teaching up to their third year of teaching. Three years are suggested because over time, this group will enlarge and level off as more students' graduate and some of the prior graduate's phase out of the discussions. They are not asked to stop coming; it is just that attrition occurs by default.

These discussions should take on various topics such as the former students' understanding(s) of the program they completed, what interactions or experiences during their matriculation helped them perform their jobs at an efficient level, and/or what hindered them. Were their understandings about teaching accurate or were misconceptions apparent? What should they add or delete, based on sound justifications? These and other questions can be posed to this group based on the particular needs or interests of the program faculty.

To maintain organization of this section on recommendations, comments will be made in the order of the indicators. These recommendations are not meant to suggest that the GSU HPETE program is not effective or coherent. Instead, they are made based on the belief that any and all programs have room for improvement and these recommendations could assist the program in becoming more coherent. Recommendations will only be cited where the researcher found a designated need.

In **Indicator I**, it is suggested that the faculty try using Appendix E, a suggested Syllabus Coherency Matrix, developed by the researcher to increase the level of cohesion in the course syllabi. Not only would this interconnect and inter-relate all aspects of the course content, but it would also be extremely useful in complying with mandated

NCATE/PSC matrices, and INTASC Standards (Standards used by NASPE to develop the beginning teacher standards in Physical Education).

Additionally, if needed and time permits, sharing information about the HPETE program with the staff members would facilitate a better understanding of the Physical Education program and how it relates to the other major areas within the Kinesiology and Health Department.

One more suggestion is to provide program students with a copy of the equipment/supplies/resources list. An explanation about the procedures used to checkout and return the equipment should be included as well.

Indicator III. Faculty may want to have a hard copy of the program goals and objectives available in their offices for easy reference. If not, verbal knowledge of at least some of the objectives should be available when requested. The researcher is sure they know them and more course-specific questions may need to be generated to get a more accurate measure of the faculty member's knowledge of program objectives.

Part of **Indicator IV** looked at grading. This researcher agrees with the findings of Mitchell (2000) in that more discriminating grading in the content and methods courses may be needed. It was expected and is the case in most programs that over 93% of the students taking Student Teaching and the Capstone Seminar received an "A." This could mean that by the time the students arrived to do student teaching that they had demonstrated the needed skills and were performing quite well in the schools. This was reflected by the meritorious commendations that the faculty and cooperating teachers gave to their students. On the other hand, it could also mean that the grading scale for

these two courses might need to be revisited for clearer articulation. This can and should only be determined by the faculty members involved in the program. Upon examining the evaluation guidelines for Student Teaching, the facts are made clear for understanding the grading procedure. As stated in the Student Teaching Handbook:

> Although the student will receive a grade, special effort is made to minimize this fact. The student is encouraged to implement the teaching-learning process as best he/she can and let the final evaluation take care of itself. The student teacher is not expected to perform as a "master" or "complete" teacher during or even at the end of his/her practice teaching. It is the University's position that teacher preparation is a long-term process, and practice teaching is an *initial* effort in *one* aspect of the program. If the student demonstrates attributes as cited on the evaluation form, recognizes his/her relative strengths and weaknesses, and definitely shows commitment toward improving his/her abilities, the endeavor will have served its main purpose in the program. The form "Standards for Grading Student Teachers" should assist the cooperating teacher in evaluation. (Grading Guidelines, 2000)

Next, in **Indicator VI**, as was found in Mitchell's study, approaches to curriculum that were interdisciplinary or integrative in nature, in relation to the General Education Core and the School of Education Core, has remained a difficult challenge. Setting aside time to address this issue was even more challenging since the major faculty must concentrate their time and effort on content and consistency in their own courses. The

two years of General Education Core requirements in most instances, is holding its own! It would seem that planned collaboration with faculty instructing some of these courses would help bring this element more towards cohesion, however, to do this across multiple disciplines would make the job of the General Education faculty quite substantial.

In **Indicator IX** we see that the low level of communication between General Education faculty and program faculty caused this rating to be low. The seed was planted during this research study to encourage more communication regarding course content and integration between these two departments at the university.

Indicators XIII and XIV look at research and continued formative assessment of the program. It is understood that the work the faculty have done over the past seven years has produced substantial and promising results and the program faculty utilize the information from the ongoing assessments to revise and improve their program on a continuous basis. In the interviews with faculty, they seemed not to be looking at or considering having the undergraduate students participate in their research, beyond being participants in their studies. This is understood since the active research being conducted is on the undergraduate program. They do, however, involve graduate students in their action research. One of their students participated in the research and is included in the publication of the Journal of Teaching in Physical Education (July 2000).

Summary

The specific information contained in this chapter will have significant meaning to the GSU HPETE program. It will add to the other data they are collecting on a regular

basis. The various types of data they are collecting will prove to be invaluable information for them and those who read about and learn from their documented experiences.

Thus, the GSU HPETE program is driven by clear conceptions of schooling and teaching. The faculty members are involved in experimental action research and are leaders in their field in conducting and reporting assessment research. The program has distinctive qualities in that it is field-based from the beginning to the end of a student's matriculation. Because the program utilized the NASPE Standards for Beginning Physical Education teachers, the program has a strong sense of reasonableness and clarity associated with the major goals of the program. Some aspects of the program are considered to be academically challenging; however none of the students had any doubt that they could and would complete the requirements of the program.

Themes are evident and cohesive throughout the program, however it remains a challenge to gain balance and integration with the General Education Core courses. Quite the contrary was found to be true with the cohort groups in the program because they are tightly knit groups that are easily identifiable within the program. The student teachers interviewed were in the process of completing their student teaching practicum. They were pleased with their experiences and felt they had accomplished a lot within their two 8 week experiences. With this institution being located in an urban/commuter and nonresidential setting, it makes it even more challenging for this program to thrive. Majors must attend classes as scheduled and any students having jobs must schedule

them around their class times. Both the students and the faculty identified the "block" as the most challenging aspect of the program.

When we looked at integration and interdisciplinary teaching, it was found that within the major, this area was coherent. However, when discussing related connections to other required college courses, much work still needs to be done.

The program has more than adequate equipment, supplies and information/ communication resources. These are available within the program and from the university at large. The unification of activities which takes place on campus and in the field is commendable. In fact, the practicum courses are actually taught on-site in the public schools. The supervising teacher(s), student teacher's and the cooperating teachers are all present there in the schools, which is an advantage of the "block."

The direct linkage with research and development for this program is that it is respected as a "model" HPETE program that is being reported on in the HPETE literature. The faculty members are major contributors and participants to the current literature in the field. They conduct ongoing formative assessments on their program and then report back to the professional association and journals.

Assessing for Coherency in Teacher Education Programs has been interesting. The truth of the matter is that it was very time-consuming and broad based, yet it uncovered an immense amount of information for any program that will take the time to complete it. The information gathered will assist the program in making needed changes and will identify for them, if not exactly, very closely, what changes need to be made. It does not go without mention and it is understood that the work and extensive progress

the faculty have made over the past seven years is highly commendable and academically substantive. This is evidenced by the degree of support and recognition given to the department by the University System of Georgia as well as the National Association for Sports and Physical Education. They have demonstrated professionalism and courage in taking on the risks and workload necessary to be "ground-breakers" of this endeavor, which has resulted in the program becoming a "model" for other successful teacher education programs.

So, fellow colleagues of teacher education, step up to the plate as this program has done, to start a process that could help take your program to the next level and possibly into a new paradigm. While it is not "all-inclusive" of assessments to be conducted, it is a substantial foundation upon which to build for the desired outcome most institutions are seeking, that of program improvement.

APPENDIX A

COHERENCY ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL (CAP)

Teacher Education - Data Acquisition Table
Program Goals, Information Sources, and Rubric, by Indicator

Data Acquisition Table

Indicator	Data Sources	How Information Acquired
I. **Programs of teacher preparation are driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 246).	Structured interviews	Interviews with faculty members
II. **Faculty appears to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 246).	Structured comments from faculty interviews and major course syllabi.	Interviews with faculty members and review of major course syllabi.
III. **A sense of reasonableness and clarity are associated with the major goals of the program** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).	Program documents and interviews	Review of course syllabi, program goals & objectives, faculty interviews
IV. **The program is rigorous and academically challenging, and students have to work hard to achieve** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).	Institutional documents for academic entry, retention and exit from program, program guidelines, interviews	Review of institutional documents and responses from student interviews

****All interviews were taped with prior approval of interviewees****

Appendix A (Continued)

Indicator	Data Sources	How Information Acquired
V. **Themes run throughout the curriculum, like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 248).	Interviews and course syllabi	Faculty, student, cooperating-teacher interviews, and course syllabi
VI. **There is an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge that can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 248).	Interviews and course syllabi	Faculty and student interviews and course syllabi
VII. **Student cohort groups exist** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 249).	Course enrollment documents and interviews	Review of course enrollment documents and interviews
VIII. **At some point in the program, cohorts encounter a milestone or benchmark or shared ordeal** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 250).	Interviews	Faculty and student interviews
IX. **Organizational and structural features of the programs enable an interdisciplinary or integrative approach to curriculum** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 250).	Interviews	Faculty and student interviews
X. **Adequate "life space" is found within the curriculum** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).	Formal course catalogs and interviews.	Faculty and student interviews
XI. **There are adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived Laboratory component in the program** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).	Interviews, departmental inventory list (student access)	Student interviews

Appendix A (Continued)

Indicator	Data Sources	How Information Acquired
XII. **There are numerous curriculum articulations between the activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 252).	Interviews and course syllabi	Faculty, students and cooperating teacher's interviews, review of course syllabi
XIII: **There is some direct linkage with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p 253).	Interviews	Faculty and student interviews
XIV: **A plan for systematic program evaluation exists** (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 253).	Interviews, departmental data bank, Assessment Project publication	Interviews with faculty and review of published findings from Departmental Assessment Project.

Appendix A (Continued)

Teacher Education

Program Goals, Information Sources, and Rubric, by Indicator

The fourteen-(14) indicators of program coherence have been taken from Howey and Zimpher (1989). The information sources, sources of data collection and the assessment rubric are being utilized to determine the presence or absence of coherence.

Program Coherency Self-Assessment Model

Indicator 1: Programs of teacher preparation are driven by clear conceptions of schooling/teaching (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 246).

Proof

1. Beliefs about the purposes of schools, teachers and the discipline of physical education are consistent across faculty members.
2. Course instructors and/or syllabi reflect expectations consistent with the beliefs expressed by faculty.
3. Students are able to identify beliefs consistent with faculty and syllabi regarding key purposes of schools, teachers and the discipline.
4. Staff members in the department have similarly consistent beliefs with the faculty about the purpose and function of schools and the importance of Physical Education in the schools at levels P-12.
5. A review of all the major-program syllabi to determine if the objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and evaluation criteria "match-up" to meet the intended objectives.

Appendix A (Continued)

6. Cooperating teachers for the department have similarly consistent beliefs about the purpose and function of schools and the importance of Physical Education in the schools at levels P-12.

Information Sources

1. In formal and informal interviews with the four (4) major **faculty** members, the following questions were asked:
   (a) What do you see as the main purposes of schools?
   (b) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?
   (c) What do you consider to be the main function(s) of schools?
   (d) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to students?
   (e) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in schools at the elementary level?
   (f) At the middle school level?
   (g) At the high school level?
   (h) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated?
2. Instructors/syllabi reflect expectations consistent with beliefs expressed by faculty. The approach chosen to facilitate the collection of data follows:
   (a) Collect course syllabi for each of the courses in the major program indicated by the university catalog and the major planned program. If the documents are

Appendix A (Continued)

comprehensive, search for the extent to which purposes and/or functions are explicitly addressed in the formal course objectives, in the outline of learning experiences, in the description of course assignments, and/or in the strategies for assessment of student performance.

(b) Interview course instructors to gather insight into each of the areas described above.

3. In formal and informal interviews with six **student teachers**, 4 **early program students** and three **pre-student teaching students, (or a reasonable cross section of students)** the following question was asked:

(a) What do you see as the main purposes of schools?

(b) Here in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

(c) What do you consider to be the main function(s) of schools?

(d) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to students?

(e) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in schools at the elementary level?

(f) At the middle school level?

(g) At the high school level?

(h) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is are communicated?

Appendix A (Continued)

(i) Look over the charts in front of you. For those courses that you have taken, are there any differences in what is indicted and your actual experience(s) in the course(s)? If yes, please explain.

4. In formal and informal interviews with the **one** staff member, the following questions were asked:

   (a) What do you see as the main purpose(s) of schools?

   (b) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

   (c) What do you consider to be the main functions(s) of schools?

   (d) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to the students?

   (e) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in the schools at the elementary level?

   (f) At the middle school level?

   (g) At the high school level?

   (h) Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to the students?

   (i) What resource materials/equipment/teaching resources, etc., are available for student use?

5. Major program course syllabi were reviewed and interviews were conducted with major program faculty to determine if the objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria "match-up" to meet the intended objectives.

Appendix A (Continued)

6. In formal and informal interviews with the two (2) cooperating teachers, each having been working with the program prior to and throughout the program revisions, (at least the past 8 years), the following questions were asked:

   (a) What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in schools?

   (b) What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in schools at the elementary level?

   (c) At the middle school level?

   (d) At the high school level?

Benchmarks

1.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Each faculty member's views are consistently described with similar terms in the areas targeted.

   4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the faculty member's consistently responded with similar terms in the areas targeted.

   3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: About one third of the faculty member's consistently responded with similar terms in the areas targeted.

   2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Varied and inconsistent responses given by each faculty member.

   1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No continuity and/or vague responses.

1.2 5 = Strong Evidence of Coherency: Clear connections exist between the course objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and assessments of student performance.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Clear connections exist in most of the course syllabi and contain coordinated course objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and assessments of student performance.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: About one third of the syllabi show clear coordinated connections between course objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and assessments of student performance.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Inconsistencies exist in syllabi content. Specific course experiences are either missing or difficult to identify.

1 = Not Enough Information In the Course Syllabi: Unable to coordinate views of faculty with syllabi content.

1.3 5 = Strong Evidence of Coherency: Views of each student are consistent and common language used to describe their understanding of the purposes of schools, teachers and physical education in the schools.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Most of the student's views are consistent on the purpose and function of schools, as well as the age appropriate activities on what is specifically appropriate at each school level.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one third of the students had common responses to the purpose and function of schools, yet some were not sure about the age appropriateness of activities at different levels.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Too few of the students comments showed continuity.

Appendix A (Continued)

1 = Not Enough Information In the Course Syllabi: Students beliefs were not in agreement with what was stated in the syllabi, nor their understanding of the purpose and function of schools.

1.4 5 = Strong Evidence of Coherency: The staff member's views were consistent with the views of the faculty and the students on the purpose and functions of schools, and the purpose of physical education in the schools.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: The staff member's views are consistent but lack complete agreement with the faculty and students.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the staff member's responses were consistent yet lacked complete agreement with the views of the faculty and students.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Too few of the staff member's responses were in agreement with that of the faculty and students.

1 = Not Enough Information In the Course Syllabi: Staff member's beliefs were not in agreement with that of the faculty and the contents of the course syllabi, or was unable to sufficiently comment.

1.5 5 = Strong Evidence of Coherency: All of the major course objectives, learning experiences, assignments, and evaluation criteria "match-up" to meet the stated objectives.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Over half of the stated objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria match the views and outcomes of the designated courses.

Appendix A (Continued)

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one third of the stated objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria match the views and outcomes of the designated courses.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Too few of the stated objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria match the views and outcomes of the designated courses.

1 = Not Enough Information In the Course Syllabi: The stated objectives, learning experiences, assignments and evaluation criteria do not "match-up" to achieve the stated objectives.

1.6 5 = Strong Evidence of Coherency: The Cooperating teachers interviewed agreed on all of the questions asked and all of their responses were consistent.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: A majority of the responses were consistent, but some responses lacked full agreement.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Only half or less than half of the cooperating teacher's responses were consistently in agreement.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Inconsistencies existed in the cooperating teachers' responses and few were in agreement.

1 = Inadequate Information Derived from Respondents: Not enough information was obtained from the cooperating teachers to indicate any type of consistency.

Indicator 2: Faculty appears to coalesce around experimental programs, planned variations and programs that have distinctive qualities and specific symbolic titles. (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 246).

Appendix A (Continued)

Proof

1. The faculty talk about themselves as having a specific identity as a program (i.e., beyond merely being members of the college or larger department).
2. There is a sense of ownership of the program – courses do not belong to individual faculty members, per se; rather, all faculty have a vested interest in courses being taught in particular ways, and the faculty control what courses are taught, how, and when.
3. There is evidence of efficacy in that there is a sense of purpose behind faculty efforts and a sense that progress is being made toward achieving that purpose; for individual courses, for the students who graduate from the program, and for the program overall.

Information Sources

1. In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following questions:
   (a) Are there different groups of faculty within this department who have shared interests (in a particular focus area in Physical Education)? If yes, can you identify the group(s) and how their interests might differ from other group(s)?
   (b) Who is primarily responsible for the design and delivery of the teacher preparation program?
   (c) Who decides when and how revisions might be required in the teacher preparation program?
2. (a) What are the main courses in the (physical education) program curriculum?
   (b) Who is responsible for preparing course outlines/syllabi/ teaching the courses?

Appendix A (Continued)

(c) Has more than one faculty member ever taught specific courses? If yes, does the course differ dramatically from one faculty member to another? If yes, in what ways do they differ?

3. (a) Do you feel your input is sought and valued regarding how this program is designed and delivered?

(b) Do you feel that graduates from this program now are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago? If yes, why. If no, why?

(c) If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from this program being his or her teacher next year?

4. In formal and informal interviews with Cooperating Teachers, ask the following questions:

(a) How many years have you acted in the capacity of a cooperating teacher?

(b) How many years with Georgia State University (GSU)?

(c) (If more than 5 years) Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago? If yes, why?

(d) If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from Georgia State University's HPE program being his or her teacher next year?

Benchmarks

2.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: There is a clearly defined group of full-time faculty members responsible for the design, delivery, and revisions of the teacher preparation program.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the faculty could identify those responsible for the design and delivery of the teacher preparation program.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: A marginal number of the responses were consistently in agreement.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Responses were too varied to find any level of continuity.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No continuity in responses.

2.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: All of the program faculty discuss and agree upon course syllabi that vary minimally, if at all, by instructor for any designated session and content is primarily consistent across instructors

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the Faculty discuss and agree upon course syllabi that vary minimally, if at all, by instructor for any designated session and content is primarily consistent across instructors

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: About one third of the faculty discuss and agree upon course syllabi that vary minimally, if at all, by instructor for any designated session and content is primarily consistent across instructors.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Varied responses given and minimal communication is evident between the faculty in the teacher prep program.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No continuity in responses.

2.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Faculty input to course content is regularly sought, the program is improving and faculty would be willing to have their own children be taught by graduates from this program.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the faculty agree that their input to course content is sought, that the program is improving, and they would be willing to have their own children be taught by graduates from the program.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: About one third of faculty agree that their input is sought into course or program content, the program is not measurably better that it was 5 or more years ago, and faculty members express discomfort in the prospect of having the average graduate actually teaches his or her own children.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: The faculty felt that their input was not sought into course or program content, the program could not be determined to have improved over the past 5 or more years, and were reluctant to agree to their child being taught by one of the program graduates.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: There was no consistency, but varied responses to the areas questioned. Inadequate responses to measure any level of coherency.

2.4 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: All of the cooperating teacher's responses were in agreement and consistent with one another. They have worked with the student teachers from this institution prior to and before the past 5 years and they agree that the graduates have improved considerably over this time period. They agreed that the student teachers would be excellent teachers for their own children.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Most of the respondents consistently agreed that they had been working with the student teacher's from the institution for at

least the past 3 to 5 years and that the graduates had improved over this time period. They agreed that the student teachers would be excellent teachers for their own children.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Not all of the cooperating teachers had been working with the student teachers long enough to determine if any improvement had taken place over the past 5 yeas. They agreed that the student teachers were very competent and that they would like for them to teach their own children.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Varied responses don't allow for any agreement that the student teachers from this program have improved over the past 5 years. Student teachers demonstrate competence, but the cooperating teachers were reluctant to say if they would want the student teachers to teach their own children.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No sufficient continuity in responses to make a measurable determination about the cooperating teachers beliefs regarding the student teacher's from this program.

Indicator 3: A sense of reasonableness and clarity are associated with the major goals of the program (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).

Proof

1. There is an explicit written set of major goals for the program and these goals are available to all who wish to read them.
2. The major goals are know and make sense to faculty and students within the program and to also to inform external auditors who may review the program.

Appendix A (Continued)

3. There is evidence of consistency between program goals and course syllabi (i.e., prominent goals described by faculty appear in course objectives, are obviously linked to topics of lecture and discussion in the course outline, and can be tied to specific assignments—term papers, midterm and final exams, etc.).

Information Sources

1. Ask each faculty member if they can produce a written copy of the major goals of the program.
2. After reviewing the formal written major goals of the program, consider the following Questions:
   (a) Do these goals make sense to you or are they filled with empty rhetoric?
   (b) Ask each faculty member to identify one or two of the major goals (i.e., from memory rather than as read from a document), then choose one or two goals and ask where in the program the goals are addressed.
3. Gather course syllabi for major courses and look for links to the major goals.
4. In formal and informal interviews with cooperating teachers, ask if they are familiar with the major goals and objectives of the HPE program at GSU? Do they make sense to you or are they just senseless rhetoric?

Benchmarks

3.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Faculty members can easily produce the requested documents.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Faculty had difficulty locating the documents, but are able to locate them.

Appendix A (Continued)

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Only a few of the faculty members are able to identify and produce the documents.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Not only are the documents not retrievable, but the faculty members are uncertain about what they are.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: The Faculty is completely unaware of the program goals.

3.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Goals are realistic and achievable and faculty can state the major goals with clear evidence of how and where goals are addressed in the program.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Goals are realistic and achievable but the faculty is unable to state the goals from memory. They are able to identify where the goals are addressed in the program when a written copy is utilized.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Goals are known in general terms, but not formally stated. Faculty members are unable to clearly identify where in the program they are addressed.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Faculty members are unable to identify goals or state where they are addressed in the program even when written copies are supplied.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Faculty members have no idea what the program goals are.

3.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Connections between program goals and course descriptions are clear and it is reasonable to expect goals will be achieved through the multiple experiences described.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Most of the program goals and course descriptions are clear and it is possible to expect that the goals will be achieved, yet the experiences described leave room for some question of the measurable extent to which the goals will be achieved.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Some of the program goals and course descriptions are clear, but logical connections between the goals and the intended experiences lead one to doubt that the goals will be accurately achieved.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Program goals are not clearly identified or stated in the course outlines, thus rendering the experiences and assignments to be questionable.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Course syllabi do not identify program goals or content objectives. No evidence of outcomes stated or implied.

3.4 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers are able to identify program goals and objectives and indicate that they clearly make sense.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Not all of the cooperating teachers are able to identify program goals and objectives, but indicate that when read, they make sense.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: None of the cooperating teachers were aware of the program goals, but were in agreement when they read them that they made sense.

Appendix A (Continued)

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers were not aware of the program goals and they felt the program goals were more rhetoric that substantive and reasonable.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Cooperating teachers had never seen the program goals, nor were there any written goals to show them for comment.

Indicator 4: The program is rigorous and academically challenging, and students have to work hard to achieve (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 247).

Proof

1. There are formal standards and procedures for entry into, continuation in, and graduation from the program that are higher than the absolute minimum for the institution.
2. Program standards are formally published and enforced.
3. When course records are reviewed, there is evidence that not all students receive top grades in all courses, based on a grading policy that differentially rewards different levels of competence in student work.
4. Students within the program are able to identify aspects of the program that are particularly academically challenging.

Information Sources

1. Consult institutional documents to identify the following:
   (a) minimum grade point average from high school and/or standardized test score required for entry into the institution.

Appendix A (Continued)

(b) minimum grade point average required for entry into the teacher preparation program.

(c) Minimum grade point average to remain academically eligible to continue toward a degree.

(d) Minimum grade point average to remain academically eligible to continue toward teacher certification.

(e) Minimum grade point average for graduation, as mandated by the institution.

(f) Minimum grade point average for graduation within the teaching option.

2. Obtain a copy of the program guidelines for entry, continuing eligibility, and graduation from the department .
3. Obtain a copy of course grades for several courses within the major (student identity concealed for privacy). Match grades received with the relevant course syllabus where requirements for course grades are described.
4. In formal and informal interviews with students about to student teach and those who have finished student teaching to:

(a) describe one or more parts of the teacher preparation program that challenged them.

(b) explain how the aspects of courses described where challenging.

Benchmarks

4.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Guidelines for entry, retention, and graduation are well above institutional minimums.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Guidelines for entry, retention, and graduation are consistent with institutional minimums.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Guidelines for entry, retention, and graduation, if able to locate, are the same as the institutional minimums.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Guidelines for entry, retention, and graduation are inconsistent across disciplines.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Unable to locate or identify institutional guidelines to compare with program guidelines.

4.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Specific guidelines are published in a formal institutional document that is readily accessible to prospective and current students.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Program guidelines are published in a formal institutional document however access is difficult, but possible to acquire.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Program guidelines are not readily accessible to prospective or current students and most often are available, if at all, only through direct consultation with one or more individuals whose specific duties include evaluating entry, retention, and/or graduation.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Program guidelines for entry, retention, and graduation, are not published specifically by the program, only in the college catalog.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Unable to access guidelines from college catalog or program document.

Appendix A (Continued)

4.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Course grading policies reflect higher achievement levels than the minimal competency and course grades reflect a range of grades received beyond all "A's".

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Course grading policies reflect average achievement level expectations and course grades reflect most students earning "B's and C's".

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Course grading policies are either absent or difficult to interpret and course grades show a predominance of "A's" for students who attended, or "D's and F's" for those who did not attend often and/or did not drop the course.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Course grading policies are not present, therefore grading is spasmodic and undefined.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Either vague or no grading policies are stated in course syllabi.

4.4 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Students are able to identify specific parts of the program that challenged them intellectually and/or emotionally and not just from a "stamina" perspective.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Students identified their "challenges" merely in terms of basic concept application, primarily being challenged by time constraints.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Challenging aspects of the program are unidentifiable. If any part is identified, there is merely a "workload" focus here.

Simply stated, students were merely challenged to complete the assignments, not challenge their intellect to complete the tasks.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: None of the students identified any challenges related to their matriculation in this program.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Students did not identify any challenging aspects of the program.

Indicator 5: Themes run throughout the curriculum, like threads, in which key concepts, like buttons, are tied together throughout a variety of courses, practica, and school experiences (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 248).

Proof

1. Faculty can identify key concepts that are intentionally addressed at different levels across the curriculum.
2. Syllabi reflect important topics that receive attention in more than one course at different levels of emphasis (i.e., introduction, comparison or contrast with other topics, detailed or in-depth study). The attention could take the form of one or more of the following: Readings, lecture topics, project assignments, term paper topics, practica, and the like.
3. Students confirm contents of syllabi and the different concentrations on topics across courses.
4. Cooperating teachers who supervise student practica are able to identify key concepts that students should have mastered before they arrive at the school.

Appendix A (Continued)

5. Cooperating teachers who supervise student practica are able to identify key concepts that they are expected to reinforce for student teachers that arrive at their school.
6. In formal and informal interviews with the cooperating teachers, ask the following: Have the supervising teachers communicated with you:
   (a) to discover what is taught?
   (b) to discuss types of experiences and expectations?
   (c) to describe what their student's need from their student teaching experiences?
   (d) to obtain feedback from you as to whether they need to make program modifications to improve the performance of their students.

Information Sources

1. Referring back to Indicator #3, each faculty member was asked to identify one or two of the major goals (i.e., from memory rather than as read from a document), and then asked to choose one or two goals to find out where in the program the goals were addressed. Here it needs to be identified how treatment of the major goals might be different in different courses within the program, if goals are identified as being addressed in different courses. For example:
   (a) Faculty identified that "Goal 1" is addressed in different courses in the program. How might this treatment be different in "course a" (early in the program) from treatment in "course b" (later in the program)?
2. Request copies of course syllabi for major courses within the program; if syllabi are incomplete, use formal or informal interviews to inquire of most recent instructors regarding documentation of types of assignments and purposes of assignments.

Appendix A (Continued)

3. In formal or informal interviews with students, confirm that assignments in the course syllabi were actually assigned and graded.
4. In formal or informal interviews with two or more cooperating teachers routinely involved with the preparation program, ask what kinds of knowledge and skills do you find their student teachers have mastered?
5. In formal or informal interviews with two or more cooperating teachers routinely involved with the preparation program, ask what kinds of knowledge and skills are you expected to reinforce with student teachers?
6. In formal or informal interviews with two or more cooperating teachers routinely involved with the preparation program, ask have the Supervising Teachers communicated with you to:
   (a) Discover what is taught?
   (b) Discuss types of experiences and expectations?
   (c) Describe what their student's need from their student teaching experiences:

Benchmarks

5.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Goals can be identified and the faculty members can clearly articulate how treatment of concepts is different in different courses—i.e., introductory treatment early in the program through application and refinement later in the program.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Goals are clearly identified, and faculty members can articulate how treatment of the some concepts is different in different courses.

Appendix A (Continued)

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Goals are difficult to identify and faculty members are unable to describe how treatment of given concepts or experiences might be different across courses in the program.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Goals are not identified or faculty members are not award of what they are although they are supposedly embedded into the curriculum.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Faculty members are not award of the program goals.

5.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Course assignments reflect differential treatment of similar concepts across courses.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: A majority of the assignments observed reflect differential treatment of similar concepts across courses.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Course assignments vaguely and minimally reflect discernible differences of treatment across courses.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No identifiable differences observed regarding differential treatment of concepts across courses.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Course assignments lack any identifiable mention of different concepts and differential treatment of those concepts.

5.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Students confirm the differential treatment of topics across courses.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Students confirm some indication of differential treatment of topics across courses.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Students contradict the differential treatment of topics across courses. If addressed, topics are treated similarly, with few modifications or interpretations being made to increase and further develop student understanding.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Students are unable to identify any differential treatment of topics across courses.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Students were not familiar with the possibility of concept differentiation across courses.

5.4 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers are able to identify key concepts that students should have mastered prior to arriving for a practicum experience, and cooperating teacher views are consistent across sites.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers are able to identify key concepts that students should have mastered prior to arriving for a practicum experience, however cooperating teacher's views are minimally consistent across sites.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers are not able to identify specifics of what students should have mastered, beyond simplistic descriptions of a college education. Multiple inconsistencies exist between cooperating teachers views across sites.

Appendix A (Continued)

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers have no specific guidelines to follow regarding the necessary practicum experiences the program candidates require. Cooperating teacher's views are different across sites.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Cooperating teachers were minimally expressive about basic skills student teachers need prior to practicum experiences.

5.5 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers indicate that they are able to identify key concepts that they are expected to reinforce for student teachers that arrive at their school and guidelines are suggested/provided by the institution as well.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers indicate that the supervising teachers communicate very clearly to them in open discussions about the institutions and the program's expectations of what skills and concepts they are to reinforce in the student teachers. No written guidelines are provided.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers are not able to identify specifics from the institution of what students should master during their practicum experience, beyond simplistic descriptions of being in schools. Cooperating teacher views differ across sites.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers are aware via personal experience, not formal requests, of what student teachers need to experience during their practicum in the schools.

Appendix A (Continued)

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Cooperating teachers had minimal, if any, input from the supervising teachers or the institution on what their expectations are.

5.6 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers indicated that supervising teachers communicated with them to discover what they teach and the types of experiences they provide the student teachers. Additionally, the supervising teachers share with the cooperating teachers what their students need from their student teaching experience and to obtain feedback from them on their views related to any suggested modifications that may be needed to improve the performance of their students.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers indicated that supervising teachers minimally communicated with them to discover what they teach and the types of experiences they provide the student teachers. Additionally, maybe one of the supervising teachers share with the cooperating teachers what their students need from their student teaching experience and to obtain feedback from them on their views related to any suggested modifications that may be needed to improve the performance of their students.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers indicated that supervising teachers did not communicate with them to discover what they teach or the types of experiences they provide the student teachers. Additionally, few of the supervising teachers share with the cooperating teachers what their students need from their student teaching experience and to obtain feedback from

Appendix A (Continued)

them on their views related to any suggested modifications that may be needed to improve the performance of their students.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers indicated that they had minimal, if any, communication with the supervising teachers.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No communication between cooperating teachers and the supervising teachers beyond intermittent evaluations on the student teachers.

Indicator 6: There is an appropriate balance and relationship between general knowledge that can be brought to bear pedagogically, pedagogical knowledge, and experience designed to promote pedagogical development (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 248).

Proof (Proof for this indicator is essentially subjective)

1. Faculty should be able to describe expected relationships among each of several different types of knowledge (general, pedagogical, experiential) and identify program attempts to recognize, reinforce and integrate this knowledge through relationships among each type of knowledge.
2. Students should be able to describe different experiences in their program and be able to describe how what has been learned in one part of the program has received additional attention elsewhere in the program (especially from a general topic like psychology to a specific pedagogical application like a methods or student teaching experience).

Appendix A (Continued)

3. Syllabi (especially course outlines for courses like senior seminars, curriculum and methods of teaching) should reflect attention to integrating different types of knowledge from different parts of the pre-service preparation from within and beyond the program?

Information Sources

1. In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following questions:
   (a) Can you identify anything that students learn in any general required course (i.e. history, psychology, math, etc.) that is somehow reinforced in a methods course and/ or in a practicum experience?
   (b) Have you ever communicated with general education instructors who typically teach courses that teacher preparation students take to discover what is taught or to describe what your students need from those courses? If so, what if any modifications have been made to any courses?
   (c) Have you ever communicated with cooperating teachers who typically supervise students in practicum experiences to discover what is taught, types of experiences and expectations, or to describe what your students need from those experiences? If so, what if any modifications have been made to any courses or experiences.
2. In formal or informal interviews with students, ask the following question:
   Can you identify anything that you have learned in any general education required course (i.e., history, psychology, math, etc.) that is somehow reinforced in a methods course and/or in a practicum experience?

Appendix A (Continued)

3. Collect and examine course syllabi (if they are complete) to identify course objectives, lecture or lab topics related to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within and/or beyond the program. If syllabi are incomplete, interview faculty responsible for selected major courses, asking them to identify course objectives, lecture topics, or laboratory experiences related to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within and/or beyond the program.

Benchmarks

6.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Faculty can describe explicit attempts to link their pedagogical efforts with faculty who teach general education courses and with cooperating teachers and can describe specific examples of how concepts are linked across all three areas (general, pedagogical, experiential) in the curriculum.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Faculty can describe a few attempts to link their pedagogical efforts with faculty who teach general education courses and with cooperating teachers, however only a few concrete examples of how concepts are linked across all three areas (general, pedagogical, experiential) could be identified in the curriculum.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Faculty can describe minimal attempts to communicate with faculty in other areas or with cooperating teachers, however no examples could be identified of how concepts are linked across all three areas (general, pedagogical, experiential) in the curriculum.

Appendix A (Continued)

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Faculty stated that they made no deliberate attempts to communicate with faculty in other areas or with cooperating teachers and could not describe any concept linkages across general, pedagogical, and experiential areas.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Faculty responded that they had no specific comments regarding this subject matter.

6.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Students are able to clearly describe program experiences and decipher the meaningful connections of experiences early on in the program with those that come later in the program.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Students are able to make content knowledge connections between earlier program course content and that which came later. Only a few examples were cited and somewhat consistent across students.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Students are able to recall various experiences and content material, but are unable to make any meaningful connections between early program experiences and those that come later in the program.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Students are unable to make any knowledgeable connections, but felt if given specific examples, maybe they could.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Students indicated they had no knowledge of connecting content.

6.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Course syllabi and/or course instructors are able to confirm the connections addressed in responses from students and faculty.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Course syllabi and/or course instructors are able to make connections, however some were vague or difficult to identify.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Course syllabi and/or course instructors are unable to confirm the connections addressed in responses from students and faculty.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Course syllabi and/or course instructors are unable to make any objective connections between course syllabi and instructor comments.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Neither the course syllabi nor the responses from course instructors warranted any definable connections.

Indicator 7: Student cohort groups exist (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 249).

Proof

1. Groups of students should be identifiable in any given major courses across quarters, semesters, and years.
2. Faculty should be able to describe selected major courses as a "junior course," a "senior course," and so forth.
3. Students should be able to identify other students with whom they have shared experiences as they have progressed together through the program.

Information Sources

1. Collect student rosters for major courses in the teacher preparation program for three or more semesters/quarters. Determine the extent to which the same names appear on courses sequenced across time.
2. Informal or informal interviews with faculty, ask the following question:

   At what point in the curriculum would students typically take [insert the name of a

Appendix A (Continued)

major course here]? Repeat this question several times until different faculty members confirm courses and levels.

3. In formal and informal interviews with students, ask the following question: Are there other students with whom you typically take courses within the teacher preparation program? If so, name some of those students and the courses.

Benchmarks

7.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: It is possible to identify groups of students that appear to form cohorts across three or more semesters/quarters within the program.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: It is possible to identify groups of students that appear to form cohorts across semesters/quarters, however very inconsistently.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: It is not possible to identify more than the occasional consistent groups of students across semesters/quarters within the program.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: It is not possible to identify any consistent groups of students across semesters/quarters within the program.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No indication of cohort groups exist.

7.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Each of faculty members in the program is able to identify the typical placement of major courses within the program.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: The majority of faculty members are able to identify the typical placement of major courses within the program.

Appendix A (Continued)

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Few faculty members demonstrate consistency in describing the timing of more than one or two major courses within the program.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Faculty members were unable to identify and/or describe the timing of major courses within the program.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Faculty responses gave no indication of when courses occurred within the program.

7.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Each student interviewed could identify other students who form their cohort within the program.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Some students can identify other students whom form their cohort within the program.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Students interviewed are unable to identify more than one or two students who are moving through the program, seemingly "with" them.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Students are not aware of other students who are moving though the program, seemingly "with" them.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Students indicated they did not notice any other students seeming to be moving through the program with them.

Appendix A (Continued)

Indicator 8: At some point in the program, cohorts encounter a milestone or benchmark or shared ordeal (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 250).

Proof

1. Students should be able to identify a course or experience that is consistently described with some awe – a course or experience that involves some trepidation and, preferably, some pride upon accomplishment. Something out of the ordinary, such as a particularly challenging practicum, interview, exam, or other experience.
2. Faculty should be able to identify a course or a set of experiences that represent a challenge and or is unique to this HPE program.

Information Sources

1. In formal and informal interviews with students, ask the following questions:
   (a) Is there any part of this program that you consider to be a potential roadblock to you becoming a teacher?
   (b) Is there a point in this program, prior to graduation, at which you believe your ability to teach will be (or has been) proven?
   (c) Is there an experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get?
   (d) Is there an experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same discipline in other parts of the state or country have (if known)?
2. In formal and informal interviews with faculty ask the following questions:

Appendix A (Continued)

(a) Are there any experiences that [HPE] student teachers have that are somewhat unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get?

(b) Are there any experiences that are somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same discipline in other parts of the state or country experience?

Benchmarks

8.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than eight students consistently identify a part of the program that is essentially challenging. Students identify numerous opportunities before graduation in which they are able to decipher whether they feel confident of their career choice, and are knowledgeable of how their program is noticeably different from other teacher preparation programs.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the students interviewed consistently identify a part of the program that is essentially challenging. Students identify at least 2 or 3 opportunities before graduation in which they are able to decipher whether they feel confident of their career choice, and are somewhat knowledgeable of how their program is noticeable different from other teacher preparation programs.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Students are unable to identify any essentially challenging part of the program. They do not consistently identify any specific experiences which aid them in confirming their career choices, and have little if any knowledge of how their program differs from other teacher preparation programs.

Appendix A (Continued)

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Students can not identify any challenging parts of the program. They could not identify any specific experiences that aided them in confirming their career choices, and have no knowledge of how their program differs from other teacher preparation programs.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No enough continuity in responses to make a comment.

8.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Faculty members are able to identify a course, set of courses, or a set of experiences that represent challenges that are unique or different from what aspiring teachers from other disciplines might get. It is also somewhat unique to itself and even other HPETE teacher preparation programs in other parts of the state or country.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: A few of the faculty members are able to identify a course/set of courses, or a set of experiences that represent a challenge and/or are unique to this particular [HPE] teacher preparation program.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Only one faculty member is able to identify a course/set of courses, or a set of experiences that represent a challenge and/or are unique to this particular [HPE] teacher preparation program.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: None of the faculty members are able to identify a course/set of courses, or a set of experiences that represent a challenge and/or are unique to this particular [HPE] teacher preparation program.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: None of the responses indicated any unique program attributes.

Appendix A (Continued)

Indicator 9: Organizational and structural features of the programs enable an interdisciplinary or integrative approach to curriculum (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 250).

Proof

1. There are opportunities for students within the program to take courses with students from other departments and disciplines.
2. Discussion about how to facilitate the teaching of key concepts of other disciplines in physical education settings is encouraged and modeled by faculty (i.e., using biology and the study of mammalian physiology to examine human performance in fitness units; linking literature and/or poetry to study dance etc.).
3. Discussion about how to facilitate the teaching of key concepts of physical education in other subject areas is encouraged and modeled by faculty (i.e., calculating batting averages in a math class; using professional sport franchises to study geography or economics, etc.).

Information Sources

1. In formal or informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:
   (a) (Students) What course(s) have you ever taken with students who are not in the same teaching track as you?
   (b) (Faculty) What course(s) do your students take with students pursuing different career tracks?

Appendix A (Continued)

2. In formal or informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:
   (a) (Students) Are there nay topics that you have covered I other courses that you have seen covered by your [physical education] faculty where you he been told how to link the ideas? For example, have there been any math or biology topics that have also been discussed in physical education?
   (b) (Faculty) Are there any topics or concepts from other courses that you try to integrate into [physical education] courses? If yes, what concepts (please be specific) and into what physical education courses, in what way(s) please be specific)?
3. In formal or informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:
   (a) (Students) Are there any topics that you have covered in physical education courses that you have seen covered by instructors in other courses? For example, have batting averages or percent body fat ever been used as examples in a math class; have any professional sport franchises been used to study geography or economics, etc.?
   (b) (Faculty) Have you ever offered or been asked for, by instructors who teach courses outside of your discipline, suggestions regarding concepts that might be relevant to your discipline? If yes, what concepts (please be specific) and into what courses outside your discipline

Appendix A (Continued)

Benchmarks

9.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Students and faculty are able to identify courses where PETE students are enrolled with students from other teaching tracks and other disciplines.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the faculty and students interviewed are able to identify courses where PETE students are enrolled with students from other teaching tracks and other disciplines.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Only a few faculty members and students are able to identify courses where PETE students are enrolled with students from other teaching tracks and other disciplines.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Students and faculty are unable to identify courses where PETE students are enrolled with students from other teaching tracks and other disciplines.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Either faculty member(s) or students are too new to the program to comment.

9.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than four students are able to specifically identify more than two concepts that are covered in general education courses and in physical education courses; students can provide specific examples for how they could link the topics in their own teaching.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: More than two students or faculty members are able to specifically identify more than two concepts that are covered in general

education courses and in physical education courses; students can provide specific examples for how they could link the topics in their own teaching.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Only one of the students or one faculty member interviewed is able to specifically identify at least two concepts that are covered in general education courses and in physical education courses; student can provide specific examples of how he/she could link the topics in his/her own teaching.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No students or faculty are able to identify two or more concepts that are covered in general education courses and in physical education courses.

1 = Not enough Information To Make a Determination: Not able to gather any consistent information to justify a measure of this item.

9.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than two students can identify more than two concepts covered in both general education courses and in physical education courses, and more than two faculty members can describe communications with general education faculty to provide insights into how physical education and other disciplines might overlap.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the students interviewed can identify more than two concepts covered in both general education courses and in physical education courses, and at least half of the faculty members can describe communications with general education faculty to provide insights into how physical education and other disciplines might overlap.

Appendix A (Continued)

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Only one or two of the students interviewed can identify one or more concepts covered in both general education courses and in physical education courses, and one or two of the faculty members can describe communications with general education faculty to provide insights into how physical education and other disciplines might overlap.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No students or faculty members can identify two or more concepts covered in general education and physical education courses, and no communications regarding curricular overlap are described between physical education faculty and general education faculty.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Not able to draw any measurable conclusions based on the responses given.

Indicator 10: Adequate life space is found within the curriculum (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).

Proof

1. There are realistic possibilities for students to take more than one route to a final degree. This may involve options for electives, the scheduling of at least some required classes to more than one time slot per year, and/or alternative degree programs leading to initial certification (i.e., possibly an undergraduate degree, combined degrees with other certifications, graduate degrees, etc.).
2. Students should be able to describe opportunities to process and integrate knowledge and skills learned in one part of the program, in later parts of the program.

Appendix A (Continued)

Information Sources

1. First, utilizing a formal course catalogs, review to find the institutions prescribed program routes to initial certification in the discipline. Then, in formal and informal interviews with students and faculty, ask the following questions:
   (a) (Students) Does everyone who wants to get the same degree as you have to take exactly the same courses? Do you know anyone who has been able to find courses different from what you have had to take?
   (b) (Faculty) There are alternatives listed in your catalog for acquiring initial certification. Are these alternatives realistic possibilities for students (i.e., versus "possible" but not "plausible")?
2. In formal and informal interviews with students ask the following questions:
   (a) Are there any topics, concepts, or skills that you learned early in your program that you had a chance to revisit, relearn, or apply in courses later in your program? For example, was there anything specific you might have done in a skill performance class that you later were able to apply in a practicum? Give more than one example if possible and please be specific.

Benchmark

10.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than four students and at least three faculty members are aware of and can identify specific students who have taken different routes to initial certification (i.e., taking different courses, time frame, or course sequences, etc.).

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: More than two students and at least two faculty members are aware of and can identify specific students who have taken different routes to initial certification (i.e., taking different courses, time frame, or course sequences, etc.).

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one student and at least one faculty member is aware of and can identify specific students who have taken different routes to initial certification (i.e., taking different courses, time frame, or course sequences, etc.).

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No students or faculty members are able to identify any students who have take more than one route to initial certification.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Neither the faculty members nor the students were able to identify any optional matriculation routs to initial certification.

10.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than four students can identify more than two concepts that they addressed in different ways across at least two courses.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least half of the students can identify more than two concepts that they addressed in different ways across at least two courses.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: Only one or two students can identify one or two concepts that they addressed in different ways across at least two courses.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: None of the students are able to identify any concepts that they addressed in more than one course across the curriculum.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Students were not familiar with cross-referenced concept applications across courses.

Indicator 11: There are adequate curriculum materials, instructional resources, and information and communication technologies, and a well-conceived laboratory component in the program (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 251).

Proof

1. There are materials available to students such that they may consult more than one source for curricular decisions (i.e., more than one methods course; more than one activity resource—books, films, cassettes, etc.).
2. There are instructional resources available to students such as VCR's, audio tape and CD players, overhead projectors, slide and film projectors, computers, and the like.

Information Sources

1. In formal or informal interviews with students, ask the following question:
   (a) If you had a question about what to teach or how to teach it, who could you ask or where would you look for help? For example, are there any course notes, course texts, or course instructors to which you could turn? If yes, which ones?
2. Request an inventory of available equipment in the department. Then, ask students the following questions:
   (a) If you had to teach an activity tomorrow, are there any instructional resources that are available to you in this department that you could use? For example, are

Appendix A (Continued)

you aware of any books, films, or other instructional aides that you could borrow for instructional purposes (i.e., to show to a class)?

(b) If you had any instructional resources, would you be able to get the appropriate means to use them? For example, can you get a VCR and monitor, or, computer(s), projectors and the like?

(c) Have you or any other students that you know ever tried to use either the instructional materials or means of presentation just addressed above?

Benchmarks

11.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than four students are able to identify more than two specific alternatives for accessing help they may need from faculty members or past course materials relating to curriculum content, instructional approaches and/or resources available to them through the department.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: More than two students are able to identify at least two specific alternatives for accessing help they may need from faculty members or past course materials relating to curriculum content, instructional approaches, and/or resources available to them through the department.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: More than two students are able to identify at least two specific alternatives for curriculum content, instructional approaches, and/or resources available to them through the department and maybe one faculty member with which they could consult.

Appendix A (Continued)

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No students are able to identify more than one specific alternative for curriculum content, instructional approaches, and/or resources available to them through the department.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No supervised inventory is kept in the department and students are not aware of what materials/resources are available to them, if at all.

11.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than four students are able to identify specific instructional materials (i.e., videos, computer programs, etc.) and the means to use the materials from the department for an instructional assignment. Furthermore, more than four students are able to identify at least two specific students that have actually used the materials in an instructional assignment.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: More than two students are able to identify specific instructional materials (i.e., videos, computer programs, etc.) and the means to use the materials from the department for an instructional assignment. Furthermore, more than two students are able to identify at least two specific students that have actually used the materials in an instructional assignment.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one student is able to identify specific instructional materials (i.e., videos, computer programs, etc.) and the means to use the materials from the department for an instructional assignment. Furthermore, at least one student is able to identify one or two specific students that have actually used the materials in an instructional assignment.

Appendix A (Continued)

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No students are able to identify specific instructional materials or the means to use them from the department for an instructional assignment and students are unaware of any other students that have used any materials supplied by the university program.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Students are not aware of any available equipment or resources available to them, thus most were unable to comment.

Indicator 12: There are numerous curriculum articulations between the activities that occur on campus and those activities that occur in schools (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 252).

Proof

1. Students are given the opportunity to see how what is done in the classroom on campus translates to what is done in the appropriate P-12 setting.
2. Course syllabi provide examples of articulations which may involve students going to the school setting and/or school personnel coming to the university setting, with a range of interaction styles (i.e., discussions, observations, assisting, and working with individual students, small groups, whole classes, and even classes across a unit of instruction.
3. Teachers who supervise in the P-12 setting should have a clear understanding of the experiences students have on the university campus and a sense of what this means in terms of skills and needs of students when they arrive in the filed settings.

Appendix A (Continued)

4. Teachers and university faculty should have a shared understanding of the experiences students need in the P-12 setting to complement their campus learning.

Information Sources

1. In formal and informal interviews with students, ask the following questions:
   (a) Is there anything that you've ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also heard "real" teachers in schools talk about? For example, how to deal with discipline, how to develop content, etc.? If yes, please provide specific examples.
   (b) Is there anything you've ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also had a chance to try in a "real" instructional setting with "real" students? If yes, please provide specific examples.
2. If comprehensive syllabi are available, search for examples of school site visits, practicum experiences, or visits from pupils and/or teachers to the campus. Then, in formal and informal interviews with faculty and students, ask the following questions:
   (a) (Students) Have you ever had to design one or more lessons for pupils and then taught them as part of a course requirement?
   (b) (Students) Have you ever been visited by teachers from local schools (or have you visited them) as part of a course requirement? If yes, please describe the nature of the interaction.
   (c) (Faculty) Are there any courses in this program where students are given the chance to work with pupils or to interact with teachers currently working in local schools? If yes, please describe the nature of those experiences and interactions.

Appendix A (Continued)

3. Identify teachers in local schools typically responsible for student practicum supervision and ask the following questions:
   (a) Are you familiar with what kinds of courses students typically have completed prior to coming to work with you and your pupils?
   (b) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students who come to work with you and your pupils?
   (c) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be your responsibility to provide access to for students who come to work with you and your pupils?
4. In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following questions and compare responses to questions (3b) and (c) above:
   (a) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students before they go to work with local schoolteachers and their pupils?
   (b) What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be the responsibility of cooperating teachers to provide access to for students who go to work with them and their pupils?

Benchmarks

12.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than four students are able to provide more than two specific examples each of instances where topics addressed in theory-based courses have been applied in practicum situations.

Appendix A (Continued)

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least three students are able to provide two or more specific examples each of instances where topics addressed in theory-based courses have been applied in practicum situations.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one students is able to provide two or more specific examples of instances where topics addressed in theory-based courses have been applied in practicum situations.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No students are able to provide specific examples of topics addressed in theory based courses that were also applied in practicum situations.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Students either were unable to or had no response to this item.

12.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than two students are able to provide more than two specific examples of opportunities to design and deliver instruction to "real" pupils.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least three students are able to provide two or more specific examples of opportunities to design and deliver instruction to "real" pupils.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one student is able to provide one or more specific examples of opportunities to design and deliver instruction to "real" pupils.

Appendix A (Continued)

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No faculty or students are able to provide more than one example each of opportunities to design and deliver instruction to "real" pupils.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No faculty or students are able to give sufficient comment related to this item.

12.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Two or more cooperating teachers consistently identify more than two types of knowledge and skill that they expect university students to bring to the practicum experience. These expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least one cooperating teacher identified more than two types of knowledge and skill that he/she expects university students to bring to the practicum experience. These expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one cooperating teacher identified one or more type(s) of knowledge and skill that he/she expects university students to bring to the practicum experience. These expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers express little if any consistency regarding substantive expectations of students for practicum experiences.

Appendix A (Continued)

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Cooperating teachers had inconsistent responses, thus disabling an objective measure of this item.

12.3 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Two or more cooperating teachers consistently identify more than two types of substantive knowledge and skill that they expect to make accessible to university students during practicum experiences, and these expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least two cooperating teachers consistently identify two or more types of substantive knowledge and skill that they expect to make accessible to university students during practicum experiences, and these expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one cooperating teacher consistently identifies one or more type(s)s of substantive knowledge and skill that he/she expects to make accessible to university students during practicum experiences, and these expectations reflect thoughtful consideration rather than ideas generated as a result of this question.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: Cooperating teachers express little if any consistency regarding substantive expectations for students during their practicum experience.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Cooperating teachers had inconsistent responses, thus disabling an objective measure of this item.

Appendix A (Continued)

Indicator 13: There is some direct linkage with research and development in teacher education, as well as into the content that informs teacher education (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 253).

Proof

1. What is done in the teacher preparation program can be tied to research. This linkage Can be tied through the engagement by faculty of students in research projects; application or interpretation of original research of faculty; or through the translation of existing research completed by others.

Information Sources

1. In formal and informal interviews with faculty and students, ask the following questions:
   (a) (Students) Have you ever participated in a research project that was being administered by a faculty member in this department?
   (b) (Students) Are you familiar with any research or researchers who have completed work that supports the ways in which you develop content or instruct in physical education? If yes, please identify someone or something (please be specific).
   (c) (Faculty) Have you ever engaged students in research that you were doing? If yes, please, provide examples and be specific.
   (d) (Faculty) Do you identify specific researchers or research results that support particular ways of developing content or designing instruction for your students? If yes, please provide specific examples.

Appendix A (Continued)

(e) (Faculty) Is your program designed to apply any principles of effective teaching or teacher preparation? If yes, please identify the parts or places in the program and the foundational research to support the experiences or program design. Please be specific.

Benchmarks

13.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: More than four students and more than four faculty members can identify specific instances of involvement with ongoing research projects, and can link names of at least two different researchers with specific insights into curriculum and/or instructional practices in teaching and/or teacher education in physical education.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Two or more students and two or more faculty members can identify specific instances of involvement with ongoing research projects, and can link names of at least two different researchers with specific insights into curriculum and/or instructional practices in teaching and/or teacher education in physical education.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one students and one or more faculty member(s) can identify specific instances of involvement with ongoing research projects, and can link names of at least two different researchers with specific insights into curriculum and/or instructional practices in teaching and/or teacher education in physical education.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No students or faculty can identify any ongoing research projects by current or recent (within the past five years) faculty

members, and can name no specific researchers to support curriculum and instructional practices in teaching or teacher education in physical education.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Neither students nor faculty had consistent responses, thus disabling an objective measure of this item.

Indicator 14: A plan for systematic program (assessment) exists (Howey & Zimpher, 1989, p. 253).

Proof

1. External assessment, internal assessment or an auditing of existing program delivery occurs.
2. There is evidence of implementation, a plan for implementation, or a reasonable explanation for why there will be no implementation of findings from the program assessment efforts.

Information Sources

1. In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following question:
   (a) Have you ever participated in or are you aware of either an internal audit or an invited external audit (other than as mandated by an accreditation agency) of this program? If yes, please elaborate, who, what, why, and when.
2. In formal and informal interviews with faculty, ask the following question:
   (a) As a result of any form of assessment of this program, whether voluntary or by accreditation mandate, what, if any, plans exist for making revisions to this program? Please be specific and provide documentation if available.

Appendix A (Continued)

Benchmarks

14.1 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: Four or more faculty members can identify specific instances of program assessment in which they have participated within the past five years (other than mandated accreditation reviews).

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: Two or more faculty members can identify specific instances of program assessment in which they have participated within the past five years (other than mandated accreditation reviews).

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: At least one faculty member can identify specific instances of program assessment in which he/she have participated within the past five years (other than mandated accreditation reviews).

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No faculty members can identify any instances of program assessment in which they have participated within the past five years (including mandated accreditation reviews).

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: Faculty responses to this item are too inconsistent to enable an objective measurement of this item.

14.2 5 = Very Strong Evidence of Coherency: At least four faculty members can identify and provide evidence (i.e. contrasting course syllabi; contrasting departmental or college documentation in catalogs or other formal publications, etc) of program revision efforts within the past five years.

4 = Moderate Evidence of Coherency: At least two faculty members can identify and provide evidence (i.e. contrasting course syllabi; contrasting departmental or

Appendix A (Continued)

college documentation in catalogs or other formal publications, etc) of program revision efforts within the past five years.

3 = Low Evidence of Coherency: One or more faculty member(s) can identify and provide evidence (i.e. contrasting course syllabi; contrasting departmental or college documentation in catalogs or other formal publications, etc) of program revision efforts within the past five years.

2 = No Evidence of Coherency: No faculty members can identify or provide examples of any program revision efforts outside of mandated revisions in the past five years.

1 = Not Enough Information To Make a Determination: No faculty members can identify or provide examples of any program revision efforts in the past five years.

Appendix A (Continued)

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Indicator I

1. What do you see as the main purpose(s) of schools?
2. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?
3. What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in schools?
4. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to the students.
5. What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of [Physical Education] in schools at the elementary level?
6. At the middle school level?
7. At the secondary level?
8. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) are communicated to students?

Indicator II

9. Are there different groups of faculty within this department who have shared interests in a particular focus area?
10. If yes, can you identify the group(s) and how their interests might differ from other group(s)?
11. Who is primarily responsible for the design and delivery of the teacher preparation program in Physical Education?
12. Who decides when and how revisions might be required in the teacher preparation program?
13. What are the main courses in the [physical education] program curriculum?
14. Who is responsible for preparing course outlines/syllabi?
15. Who teaches the courses?

Appendix A (Continued)

16. Has more that one faculty member ever taught specific courses?

17. If no, why not?

18. If yes, does the course differ dramatically from one faculty member to another?

19. If yes, in what ways do they differ?

20. Do you feel your input is sought and valued regarding how this program is designed and delivered?

21. Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago?

22. If yes, why?

23. If no, why?

24. If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from this program being his or her teacher next year?

Indicator III

25. Can you show me a written copy of the major goals of the program?

26. Do these goals make sense to you, or are they filled with empty rhetoric?

27. Could you name, say, two specific goals or objectives from memory that you are trying to address in this program? Choose one or two goals and ask where in the program the goals are addressed.

Indicator V

28. Referring back to the answer to the Hidden question, how would those goals be addressed differently earlier in the program as opposed to later in the program?

Indicator VI

29. Can you identify anything that students learn in any general education required course (i.e., history, psychology, math, etc.) that is somehow reinforced in a methods course and/or in a practicum experience?

Appendix A (Continued)

30. Have you ever communicated with general education instructors who typically teach courses that teacher preparation students take, to discover what is taught or to describe what your students need from those courses? If so, what if any modifications have been made to any courses?

31. Have you ever communicated with cooperating teachers who typically supervise students in practicum experiences to:

    - Discover what is taught?
    - Discuss types of experiences and expectations?
    - Describe what your students need from those experiences?
    - If so, what, if any, modifications have been made to any courses or experiences?

32. Of the major courses that you typically teach, looking at your course objectives, lecture topics, or laboratory experiences, how do they relate to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within and/or beyond the program, say with Math or Social Studies?

    Q: In communicating with the cooperating teachers, what do you discuss as far as discovering what is taught; how do you determine that with them?

    Q: Is there a suggested outline.

33. How do they relate to integrating knowledge from different parts of the program from within or around the program?

Indicator VII

34. At what point in the curriculum would students typically take (Kinesiology)?

Indicator IX

35. What course(s) do your students take with students pursuing different career tracks?

36. Are there any topics or concepts from other courses that you try to integrate into physical education classes? For example, do you try to integrate any math or biology topics into your physical education courses? In what way(s), please specify.

Appendix A (Continued)

37. Have you ever offered or been asked by instructors who teach courses outside of your discipline, for suggestions regarding concepts that might be relevant to the physical education, which you really answered earlier in Nutrition? (Please is specific).

38. What about any other General Education classes, say Math, History, or English?

39. Are there alternatives listed in your catalog for acquiring initial certification? Are these alternatives realistic possibilities for students (i.e., versus "possible" but not "plausible")?

40. Are there any undergraduate alternatives?

41. Could a student possibly come through your program, not complete certification, yet still graduate?

42. And then, once they take it and pass it they would be recommended, but not before?

Indicator XII

43. Are there any courses in this program where students are given the chance to work with pupils or to interact with teachers currently working in local schools? If yes, please describe the nature of those experiences and interactions.

44. What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students before they go to work with local schoolteachers and their pupils?

45. What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be the responsibility of cooperating teachers to provide access to students who go to work with them and their pupils?

Indicator XIII

46. Have you ever-engaged undergraduate/pre-service students in research that you were conducting? If yes, please provide examples. (Please be specific).

47. Is your program designed to apply any principles of effective teaching or teacher preparation? If yes, please identify the parts or places in the program and the foundational research to support the experiences or program design (please be specific).

48. Do you identify specific researchers or research results that support particular ways of developing content, designing instruction for your students, or is there application

Appendix A (Continued)

of current research methodologies that you utilize in any of your classes with your students? If yes, please provide examples. (Please be specific).

Indicator XIV

49. Have you ever participated in or are you aware of either an internal audit or an invited external audit (other than as mandated by an accreditation agency) of this program? If yes, please elaborate, who, what, why, and when.

50. As a result of any form of assessment of this program, whether voluntary or by accreditation mandate, what, if any, plans exist for making revisions to this program?

    Please be specific, and provide documentation if available. END.

Appendix A (Continued)

General Education Faculty

Questionnaire

1. What position do you hold here in the College of Education at GSU?

2. If holding a Leadership position within the College of Education, what impact does that have on the effect of your input related to what is taught in the General Education courses?

3. What or how much of the knowledge base covered in your course(s) can be utilized and reinforced in different Education major methods courses and/or practicum experiences?

4. Is the knowledge base covered in the General Education Courses integrated across disciplines?

5. Which course content can be utilized and reinforced specifically with Physical Education majors?

6. Do you have copies of the three General Education Core courses? May I have a copy of each please?

7. Have any Physical Education Teacher Education faculty talked to you to suggest the knowledge base their students need from your classes?

8. How about faculty from other Teacher Education major program areas?

9. Would you welcome interaction with other faculty from specific Teacher Education major areas?

10. What kind of interaction with other Education Program faculty would help you to determine course content appropriate across disciplines?

11. What is the process used to determine content in General Education courses?

12. What kinds of interactions occur between you and other teachers of General Education Core courses and all teacher education faculty members?

13. What kinds of interactions occur between you and Physical Education Teacher Education faculty members?

Appendix A (Continued)

14. I understand that there is a Professional Education Council within the College of Education here at GSU. What part does it play in course revisions? What criteria are used?

15. I also understand that the General Education Core courses are reviewed periodically. When they are reviewed, what criteria are used to determine content revisions?

Appendix A (Continued)

Staff Interview Questionnaire

Indicator I

1. What do you see as the main purpose(s) of schools.

2. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

3. What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in schools?

4. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to students?

5. What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of Physical Education in schools at the elementary level?

6. At the middle school level?

7. At the secondary level?

8. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

9. What resource materials/equipment/teaching resources are available for student use?

Appendix A (Continued)

Student Interview Questionnaire

What I have here is a list of the courses that are offered in your major. This other form breaks down each of the courses by individual course objectives. The third set of documents is a set of the course syllabi. Whichever you need to use to answer questions during this interview is fine.

Indicator I

1. What do you see as the main purpose(s) of schools?

2. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) is/are communicated to students?

3. What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in schools?

4. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these function(s) is/are communicated to the students?

5. What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of [Physical Education] in schools at the elementary level?

6. At the middle school level?

7. At the secondary level?

8. Where in the curriculum do you believe this/these purpose(s) are communicated to students?

Indicator IV

9. Can you identify or describe one or more parts of the teacher preparation program in physical education that was challenging for you?

10. Was it challenging in the sense that you could meet that challenge, or in the sense that you didn't think that you could do it?

Indictor V

11. What I need to know is, for the courses which you have actually taken, do you foresee, by either looking at the course syllabi or the course objectives, any differences in what is indicated and what actually took place in the class?

Appendix A (Continued)

12. How many courses have you taken in the program so far?

Indicator VI

13. Can you identify anything that you took in your general education requirements that you took, say like history, psychology, biology, economics, the general core requirements, that somehow was reinforced in any of your methods courses or practical experiences?

Indicator VII

14. Are there any students with whom you took classes with in the teacher prep program or that you took classes with?

15. How many of you are graduating now?

Indicator VIII

16. Is there any part of this program that you would consider to be a potential roadblock to your becoming a teacher?

17. Is there any point in the program, prior to graduation, in which you believe your ability to teach has been proven?

18. Is there any experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get?

19. Is there any experience or part of this program that is somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same disciplines in other parts of the state or country have (if known)?

Indicator IX

20. What courses have you taken with students who are not in the same career track as you?

21. Are there any topics that you have covered in other courses that you have seen covered by your (Physical Education) faculty where you have been told how to link the ideas? (i.e., Has there been any math concepts or language arts topics that have also been discussed in PE?)

22. Are there any topics that you have covered in Physical Education courses that you have seen covered by instructor in other courses, say math or algebra courses?

Appendix A (Continued)

Indicator X

23. Does everyone who wants to get the same degree as you, have to take exactly the same courses?

24. Do you know anyone who has been able to find courses different from what you have had to take?

25. Are there any topics, concepts, or skills that you learned early in the program that you had a chance to revisit, relearn, or apply in courses later in your program? For example, was there anything specific skills you might have done in a skill performance class that you were later able to apply in a practicum? Please give more than one specific example.

Indicator XI

26. If you had a question about what to teach or how to teach it, who could you ask or where would you look for help? For example, are there any course notes, course text you could refer to or course instructors to whom you could turn?

27. If you had to teach an activity tomorrow, are there any instructional resources that are available to you in this department that you could use? For example, are you aware of any books, films, or other instructional aides that you could borrow for instructional purposes?

28. If you had any instructional resources, would you be able to get the appropriate means to use them? For example, can you get a VCR and monitor, or computer(s), projector and the like?

29. Have you or any other students that you know ever tried to use either the instructional materials or means of presentation just addressed above?

Indicator XII

30. Is there anything that you have ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also heard "real" teachers in schools talk about? For example, how to deal with discipline, how to develop content, etc?

31. Is there anything you've ever talked about on campus with university instructors that you have also had a chance to try in a "real" instructional setting with "real" students who are not your peers?

Appendix A (Continued)

32. Have you ever had to design one or more lessons for pupils and then taught them, as part of a course requirement? If yes, what, to whom, where, and when?

33. Have you ever been visited by teachers from local schools (or have you visited them) as part of a course requirement? If yes, please describe the nature of the interaction.

34. Have you ever participated in a research project that was being administered by a faculty member in this department?

35. Are you familiar with any research or researchers who have completed work that supports the ways in which you develop content or instruct in physical education? If yes, please identify someone or something (please be specific).

Appendix A (Continued)

Cooperating Teachers Questionnaire

Indicator 1

1. What do you consider to be the main function(s) of teachers in schools?

2. What do you consider to be the fundamental purpose of **Physical Education** in schools at the elementary level?

3. At the middle-school level?

4. At the high-school level?

Indicator 2

5. How many years have you acted in the capacity of a cooperating teacher?

6. How many years with Georgia State University (GSU)?

7. (If more than 5 years) Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared than they were, say 5 years ago? If yes, Why?

8. If you had a son or daughter in a local school, how would you feel about a graduate from Georgia State University's program being his or her teacher next year?

Indicator 3

9. Are you familiar with the major goals and objectives of the HPE program at GSU?

10. Do those goals make sense to you or are they filled with empty rhetoric?

Indicator 5

11. What kinds of knowledge and skills do you find their student teachers have mastered?

12. What kinds of knowledge and skills are **YOU** expected to reinforce with student teachers?

13. Have the Supervising Teachers communicated with you to:

    (a) discover what is taught?

Appendix A (Continued)

14. Discuss types of experiences and expectations?

15. Describe what their student's need from their student teaching experiences?

16. If so, what if any modifications have been made to any course or experience as a result?

Indicator 8

17. Are there any experiences that HPE student teachers have that are somewhat unique or different from what aspiring teachers in other disciplines might get?

18. Are there any experiences that are somehow unique or different from what aspiring teachers in the same discipline in other parts of the state or country experience?

Indicator 9

19. Are there any topics or concepts from other subject matter that you try to integrate into your Physical Education classes? (i.e., Do you try to integrate math, language arts, or history concepts)?

Indicator 11

20. If a student had a question about what to teach or how to teach it, whom would you expect them to ask, you or their supervising teacher? Please elaborate.

21. Are you award of any instructional resources available to the GSU student teachers from the University?

22. Are there any instructional resources available to student teachers here at your school?

23. Do you provide any instructional resources to the student teachers? Why or Why not? (Instructional aids, video's, monitors & VCR's, etc).

Indicator 12

24. Is there anything you discuss with student teachers that they discussed on campus with their university professors? If yes, please provide examples.

25. Do the student teachers design their lessons for pupils and then teach them as part of their student teaching requirements? If yes, how soon do they begin?

Appendix A (Continued)

26. Are you familiar with what kinds of courses students typically have completed prior to coming to work with you and your pupils?

27. What kinds of knowledge and skills do you expect of students who come to work with you and your pupils?

28. What kinds of knowledge and skills do you believe to be your responsibility to provide student teachers that come to work with you and your pupils?

Indicator 13

29. Have you ever-engaged student teachers in research that you were doing? If yes, please provide examples.

Indicator 14

30. Have you ever participated in or are you aware of either an internal audit or an invited external audit (other than as mandated by an accreditation agency) of the GSU program? If yes, please elaborate.

31. As a result of any form of assessment of this program, whether voluntary or by accreditation mandate, what if any plans exist, that you are aware of, for making revisions based on assessment or feed-back outcomes?

APPENDIX B

Indicator 3.3 Major Program Courses
Standards Coverage

Major Courses		Credit Hours	Course Descriptions	Standards Addressed
KH 2130	Intro. To the Allied Fields of Health, Physical Education and Fitness	3	This course in an introduction to the allied professional fields within health, physical education, and fitness. Topics include the history, social forces, and current trends that shape contemporary health, physical education, and fitness programs in P-12	
KH2220	Musculoskeletal Function and Human Performance I	3	The performance (sport, dance, daily living skills) applications and functions of musculoskeletal anatomy in the human being are studied.	1
KH 2230	Musculoskeletal Function and Human Performance II	3	Continuation of KH 2220. This course presents introductory concepts concerning the responses of various physiological systems to acute and chronic exercise and physical activity. Lecture information includes differences between children, adolescents, and adults.	1
KH3000	Personal Health and Wellness INT. to health educ.?	3	Introduces students to contemporary health topics and issues. Students examine health risk and protective factors which influence the individual's achievement of optimal health across the life span.	1,5,6
KH 3010	Performance and Analysis Area I: Movement and Rhythmics.	2	Students develop knowledge and skill in designing and implementing movement and rhythmical activities for P-5 curriculums. Emphasis is placed on the ability to analyze and instruct the associated movement skills.	1,3,5
KH 3020	Performance and Analysis Area II: Training and Fitness	2	Students develop knowledge and skills in lifetime fitness activities such as aerobics, jogging, walking, weight training, muscle toning, and general conditioning. Emphasis is placed on developing an understanding of the health and fitness benefits provided through participation in these activities.	1,3,5,6
KH 3030	Performance and Analysis Area III: Team Sports	2	Students develop knowledge and skills in various team sports (e.g., soccer, volleyball, softball, flag football, basketball) offered in P-12 school curriculums. Emphasis is placed on developing performance skills, as well as developing the ability to analyze and teach the associated movement skills.	1-7

Appendix B (Continued)

Major Courses		Credit Hours	Course Descriptions	Standards Addressed
KH 3040	Performance and Analysis Area IV:	2	Students develop knowledge and skills in various lifetime individual and dual sports (e.g., tennis, badminton, golf, bowling, archery, racquetball) offered in P-12 school curriculums. Emphasis is placed on producing competent performers, as well as developing the ability to analyze and teach the associated movement skills.	1,2,3,6,7
KH 3050	Performance and Analysis Area V: Outdoor and Adventure Activities	2	Students develop knowledge and skill in outdoor and adventure programming, including applications for school, camp and community agencies. Several field trips are required. Emphasis is placed on producing competent performers, as well as developing the ability to analyze and teach the skills and application.	1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9
KH 3200	(TE) Instructional Skills for Health and Physical Education	3	Prerequisites: KH 2130. Introduces effective classroom management, teaching skills, and instructional models for health and physical education in grades P-12. Includes micro-and- peer-teaching laboratory experiences.	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9
KH 3550	Evaluation and Instrumentation in Physical Education	3	Surveys and written and physical tests employed in physical education are studied. Introductory statistics and the development and the skills in organizing, administering, and interpreting test scores are also objectives of the course.	1,4,6,7,8,9
KH 3600	Biomechanics	3	Prerequisites: KH 2220, KH 2230, Math 1111. The principles which influence human motion are examined. Emphasis is placed on developing the ability to analyze human motion with the goal of optimizing human movement performance.	1
KH 3660L	Biomechanics Lab	0	None given.	
KH 3610	Motor Learning and Development	4	Students gain knowledge of motor learning and development principles. Topics include the processes of skilled motor performance and motor skill acquisition, human motor development from childhood through older adulthood, the influence of perceptual, cognitive, physio9logical, and social development on motor development. Emphasis is on the practical application of concepts to the teaching of motor skills.	1,7,8
KH 3650	Exercise Physiology	3	Prerequisites: KH 2220, KH 2230; or consent of instructor. Focuses on alterations in body systems and organs during physical activity with emphasis on metabolic, cardiorespiratory, and body composition parameters.	1,2,6,7

Appendix B (Continued)

Major Courses		Credit Hours	Course Descriptions	Standards Addressed
KH 3650L	Applied Physiology Lab	0	Laboratory experiences employing physiological principles during active participation in exercise.	1,2,6
KH 3660	Practicum in Health and Physical Education	2	Prerequisites: KH 3200, current Tort liability protection, and permission of instructor. Students observe and assist health and physical education clinical teachers in a variety of P-12 school settings for no fewer than 6 hours each week.	1,2,3,4,6,7
KH 4510	Curriculum and Instruction for Pre-and Elementary Physical Education	3	Prerequisite: KH 3200. Corequisites: KH 4520, KH 4530, KH 4540. Acquisition and practice of contemporary curriculum and instruction models for preschool and elementary physical education programming are studied. Includes peer and field-based teaching experiences.	1-9
KH 4520	Curriculum & Instruction for Secondary Physical Education	3	Prerequisite: KH 3200. Corequisites: KH 4510, KH 4530, KH 4540. Acquisition and practice of contemporary curriculum and instruction models for secondary physical education programming are discussed. Includes peer and field-based practice teaching experiences.	1-7
KH 4530	Methods and Materials: Health Education	4	Prerequisite: KH 3200. Corequisites: KH 4510, KH 4520, KH 4540. Focuses on acquisition and practice of contemporary comprehensive school health education instructional strategies. Includes field-based practice teaching experiences, peer coaching during lesson plan development, and peer critiquing of field-based teaching videos. Includes introduction to media and technology used in teaching health and physical education.	1-9
KH4540	Curriculum & Instruction for Adapted and Inclusive Physical Education	3	Prerequisite: EXC 4010, KH 3200. Corequisites: KH 4510, KH 4520, KH 4530. Acquisition and practice of contemporary curriculum and instruction models for both inclusive and adaptive physical education programming are studied. Includes peer and field-based practice teaching experiences.	1-7
KH4650	Opening School Experience in Health and Physical Education	1	Prerequisite: current tort liability protection and permission of instructor. Student teachers complete a 10-day internship in one of the placement schools during the clinical teacher's pre-planning and first week of instruction.	1,2,4,9

Appendix B (Continued)

Major Courses		Credit Hours	Course Descriptions	Standards Addressed
KH 4660	Student Teaching in Health and Physical Education	12	Prerequisite: completion of all course work, first aid/CPR proficiency, current proof of tort liability protection and permission of instructor. Students observe, assist in, and instruct public school P-12 classes in health and physical education under the direct supervision of a clinical teacher. One half of the internship is in grades P-5; the other half is in grades 6-12. Includes seminars scheduled by the instructor.	1-8
KH 4700	Student Teaching in Health and Physical Education P-12	0	Prerequisites: completion of all course work, concurrent enrollment in KH 4660 and permission of instructor. Students are given an opportunity to reflect on their completed professional program, in anticipation of their teacher induction period. Includes the completion of a series of formal and informal program assessments.	1-9

APPENDIX C

Responsibilities of the Cooperating Teacher

Georgia State University, PETE Program

a. To provide the student teacher with the following information:

   (1) All school policies contained in a faculty handbook.

   (2) Physical education curricular guide and information on units he/she is expected to teach.

   (3) General background of students and community surrounding the school.

   (4) Teaching stations and available equipment.

b. To familiarize the student with the policies, practices and traditions of the school and physical education department.

c. To assist the student in recognizing the growth and developmental characteristics of students and how to meet the different needs and interests of the students.

d. To provide the student teacher with several periods of observation before assuming teaching duties.

e. To aid in the development of rapport between the student teacher and himself/herself.

f. To provide the student teacher with specific descriptive feedback regarding planning for instruction, teaching behavior, classroom management, evaluation tools and procedures, as well as other teacher-pupil aspects of the teaching experience.

Appendix C (Continued)

g. To direct and assist the student teacher in curriculum planning, including unit and lesson plans.

h. To team teach with student teacher prior to student teacher's assumption of a full class schedule.

i. To ensure that the student teacher is under continuous supervision at all times by a certified teacher.

j. To ensure that the student teacher is not used as a substitute teacher.

k. To remain with the student teacher while he/she is teaching until assistance is no longer needed.

l. To transmit on a daily basis knowledge and experience to the student teacher through suggestions and constructive criticism.

m. To aid the student teacher in his/her use of audio-visual equipment and the use of media. To aid in videotaping unit for improvement if teaching ability.

n. To evaluate the student and submit to the university supervisor midway and at the end of the placement period, an assessment of the student teacher's performance, using provided rating forms. ***All evaluations are to be reviewed with the student teacher.***

o. To evaluate the performance of the university supervisor. These forms will be available through the university supervisor.

APPENDIX D

Undergraduate Core Curriculum Areas A through E

Area A: Essential Skills (9)

1. **English Composition Requirements *(6)**
   Engl 1101 English Composition I ** (3)
   Engl 1102 English Composition II ** (3)
   *Students who satisfy the Advanced Placement Standard of the Department of English may take Engl 1103 in lieu of Engl 1101 and Engl 1102. Students who select this option will choose an additional humanities course from core Area C1.
   **Minimum grade of C or higher required in this course in order to receive degree credit.
2. **Mathematics Requirement: Select one. (3-4)***
   Math 1111 College Algebra (3)
   Math 1220 Survey of Calculus (3)
   Math 1113 Precalculus (3)**
   Math 2211 Calculus of One Variable I (4)
   Math 2212 Calculus of One Variable II (4)
   Math 2215 Multivariate Calculus (4)
   Math 2420 Discrete Mathematics (3)
   *The one additional credit hour may be counted in Area F or G, if appropriate.
   **Majors in biology, chemistry, computer science, geology, mathematics, science and math education, and physics are required to take Math 1113 or higher in Area A.

Area B: Institutional Options (4)
Additional information about institutional options is available online at http://www.gsu.edu/areab.
Select two courses from the following:
Phil 2410 Critical Thinking (2)
Spch 1000 Human Communication (2)
Pers 2001 Perspectives on Comparative Culture** (2)
Pers 2002 Scientific Perspectives on Global Problems*** (2)

Appendix D (Continued)

* Philosophy majors man not count Phil 2410 in Area B and must select two other courses to fulfill Area B requirements. See Area F requirements for philosophy students.

**Select from a group of interdisciplinary courses that provides a better understanding of the contemporary world through the study of different cultures. Only one course from this category may be used to fulfill requirements in Area B.

***Select from a group of interdisciplinary courses that deals with scientific approaches to important issues on the environment, public health, or technology. Only one course from this category may be used to fulfill requirements in Area B.

Area C: Humanities and Fine Arts (6)

Select two courses from groups 1,2, and 3 below. The two courses may not come from the same group.

1. **Humanities**
   - Engl 2110 World Literature (3)
   - Engl 2120 British Literature (3)
   - Engl 2130 American Literature (3)
   - Phil 2010 Great Questions of Philosophy (3)
   - Spch 2050 Media, Culture, and Society (3)
2. **Fine Arts**
   - Art 1700 History of Western Art I: Prehistoric through Medieval Art. (3)
   - Art 1750 History of Western Art II: Renaissance through Contemporary Art. (3)
   - Art 1850 Arts of Africa, Oceania and the Americas (3)
   - Film 2700 History of the Motion Picture (3)
   - Mus 1500 Jazz: Its Origins, Styles, and Influence (3)
   - Mus 1900 Dramatic Music from the Renaissance through the Twentieth Century (3)
   - Mus 1930 Survey of Music from Bach to Bernstein (3)
   - Thea 2040 Introduction to Theatre (3)
3. **Foreign Language * ****
   - Fren 1002 Elementary French II (3)
   - Fren 2001 Intermediate French I (3)
   - Fren 2002 Intermediate French II (3)
   - Grmn 1002 Elementary German II (3)
   - Grmn 2001 Intermediate German I (3)
   - Grmn 2002 Intermediate German II (3)
   - Ital 1002 Elementary Italian II (3)
   - Ital 2001 Intermediate Italian I (3)
   - Ital 2002 Intermediate Italian II (3)
   - Japn 1002 Elementary Japanese II (3)

Japn 2001 Intermediate Japanese I (3)
Japn 2002 Intermediate Japanese II (3)

* The J. Mack Robinson College of Business recommends that B.B.A. students include a foreign language course in Area C. The college of Arts and Sciences recommends that BA students and B.I.S. students in classical studies and women's studies not include a foreign language course in Area C. Students in these degree programs should follow departmental recommendations on foreign language selection in Area F. The Andrew Young School of Policy studies requires BA students majoring in economics to complete a foreign language in Area F.

**Some foreign language courses are not open to native speakers of that language. Please consult the course description before making a selection in this area.

Area D: Science, Mathematics and Technology (11)

Complete the option listed under either majors other than natural sciences, health sciences, and mathematics or natural sciences, and mathematics majors.

Majors other than Natural Sciences, Health Sciences, and Mathematics

1. Select one two-course sequence. (8)
   Astr 1010 Astronomy of the Solar System (4) and
   Astr 1020 Stellar and Galactic Astronomy (4)
   Biol 1107K Principles of Biology I (4) and
   Biol1108K Principles of Biology II (4)
   Chem 1101K Introductory Chemistry I (4) and
   Chem 1102K Introductory Chemistry II (4)
   Chem 1151K Survey of Chemistry I (4) and
   Chem 1152K Survey of Chemistry II (4)
   Chem 1211K Principles of Chemistry I (4) and
   Chem 1212K Principles of Chemistry II (4)
   Geog 1112 Introduction to Weather and Climate (4) and
   Geog 1113 Introduction to Landforms (4)
   Geol 1121K Introductory Geosciences I (4) and
   Geol 1122K Introductory Geosciences II (4)
   Phys 1111K Introductory Physics I (4) and
   Phys 1112K Introductory Physics II (4)
   Phys 2211K Principles of Physics I (4) and
   Phys 2212K Principles of Physics II (4)
2. Select one course (must be from a discipline different from one selected in group 1 above). (3)
   Any course from Section D1 above (4)*
   Astr 1000 Introduction to the Universe

Appendix D (Continued)

Biol 2240	Human Physiology (3)
Biol 2300	Microbiology and Public Health (3)
Chem 1050	Chemistry for Citizens (3)
CSC 1010	Computers and Applications (3)
Geol 2001	Geologic Resources and the Environment (3)
Math 1070	Elementary Statistics (3)
Math 1113	Precalculus (3)
Math 1220	Survey of Calculus (3)
Math 2420	Discrete Mathematics (3)
Phys 2030K	Physical Science: Physics of Music and Speech (3)**
Psyc 1100	Natural Science Aspects of Psychology (3)

* The extra hour in this option may be counted in Area F or G, if appropriate.

**Recommended for broadcast journalism, speech, theatre, and music majors only.

Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Physics, and Science and Math Education Majors. It is recommended that students select a sequence appropriate to the major.

1. Select one two-course sequence. (8)

Biol 1107K	Principles of Biology I (4) and
Biol 1108K	Principles of Biology II (4)
Chem 1211K	Principles of Chemistry I (4) and
Chem 1212K	Principles of Chemistry II (4)
Geol 1121K	Introductory Geosciences I (4) and
Geol 1122K	Introductory Geosciences II (4)
Phys 1111K	Introductory Physics I (4) and
Phys 1112K	Introductory Physics II (4)
Phys 2211K	Principles of Physics I (4) and
Phys 2212K	Principles of Physics II (4)

2. Select either Math 2211 (Calculus of One Variable I) or a course with a higher number that is appropriate to the major. (3-4)

Nursing, Nutrition, and Respiratory Therapy Majors

1. Select one two-course sequence (8)

Chem 1151K	Survey of Chemistry I (4) and
Chem 1152K	Survey of Chemistry II (4)
Phys 1111K	Introductory Physics I (4) and
Phys 1112K	Introductory Physics II (4)

* Chem 1151K and 1152K is recommended for this selection.

2. Math 1070 Elementary Statistics(3)

Appendix D (Continued)

Area E: Social Science (12)

Students who satisfy the requirements of Section 1, United States Politics and History, by examination and choose not to take Hist 2110 and PolS 1101 must select two additional courses from Section 3, Social Science Foundations.

1. **United States Politics and History – Legislative Requirements (0-6)**
   Hist 2110 Survey of Unites States History (3)*
   PolS 1101 American Government (3)**
   *The State of Georgia requires all students to pass examinations on the history of the Unites States and the history of Georgia. Students may satisfy these requirements by earning a passing grade in Hist 2110.
   **The State of Georgia requires all students to pass examinations on the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of Georgia. Students may satisfy these requirements by earning a passing grade in PolS 1101.
2. **World History and Politics Requirement: Select one course. (3)**
   Hist 1111 Survey of World History to 1500 (3)
   Hist 1112 Survey of World History Since 1500 (3)
   PolS 2401 Global Issues (3)
3. **Social Science Foundations: Select one course (see note above). (3-9)**
   AAS 2010 Introduction to African-American Studies (3)
   Anth 1102 Introduction to Anthropology (3)
   Econ 2105 Principles of Macroeconomics (3)
   Econ 2106 Principles of Microeconomics (3)
   Geog 1101 Introduction to Human Geography (3)
   AAS/Hist 1140 African and African-American Culture (3)
   Psyc 1101 Introduction to General Psychology (3)
   Soci 1101 Introductory Sociology (3)
   Soci 1160 Introduction to Social Problems (3)
   WSt 2010 Introduction to Women's Studies (3)
   * B.B.A. students take economics in Area F and are recommended to choose other social science foundation courses in Area E. The Andrew Young School of Policy Studies recommends that BA and BS students majoring in economics choose other selections in section 3 of Area E.

APPENDIX E

Syllabus Review Chart

Course Name	Course Number	Specific Objective	Objective Number	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match up"
Musculoskeletal Function and Human Performance	KH2220						
Musculoskeletal Function and Human Performance	KH 2230						
Introduction to Health Education (#2809)	KH 3000						
Performance & Analysis Area I: **Movement & Rhythmics**	KH 3010						
Performance and Analysis Area II: **Training and Fitness**	KH 3020						
Performance & Analysis III: **Team Sports**	KH 3030						
Performance and Analysis Area IV: **Lifetime Sports**	KH 3040						
Instructional Skills For Health and Physical Education	KH 3200						
Evaluation and Instrumentation In Physical Education	KH 3550						

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name	Course Number	Specific Objective	Objective Number	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
Biomechanics "Creating Effective Contexts for Learning" (Comp. # 5076)	KH 3600						
Biomechanics Lab	KH 3600L						
Motor Learning & Development	KH 3610						
Exercise Physiology	KH 3650						
Laboratory Policies	KH 3650L						
(TE) Practicum in Health and Physical Education	KH 3660						
Curriculum and Instruction for Pre-and-Elementary Physical Education (Comp. #2830)	KH 4510						
Curriculum & Instruction for Secondary Physical Education (Comp. #2833)	KH 4520						
Methods and Materials: Health Education (#2836)	KH 4530						
Curriculum and Instruction for Adapted and	KH 4540						

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name	Course Number	Specific Objective	Objective Number	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
Inclusive Physical Education							
Opening School Experience in Health and Physical Education (#2844)	KH 4650						
Student Teaching in Health & Physical Education P-12	KH 4660						

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Motor Learning & Development KH 2220	1	Demonstrate his/her knowledge of bony landmarks, anatomical terminology and body planes in relation to efficiency of movement patterns	Ch-7, pgs. 281-97, 334-36.	Not Specified Class Readings	4 exams	
	2	Demonstrate his/her understanding of certain structural units that carry out the functions of muscle, nerve, cardiac, and connective tissue.	Lectures/Labs	Class Readings Not specified	Exams 1-4	
	3	Demonstrate his/her understanding of the musculoskeletal system, and in particular, how complex human movement is produced by the muscles acting on bone.	Lectures/Labs	Class Readings Not Specified	Exams 1-4	
	4	Explain the mechanism of injury and structures injured in common human performance injuries.				
	5	Demonstrate his/her understanding of the main structures of the joints of the body; namely the tendons, ligaments, articular cartilage, and how these structures are involved in producing complex human movement skills and injuries.				
Musculoskeletal Function And Human Performance Physiology KH 2230	A	Develop an understanding of basic human physiological concepts.	Not specified		Exams	

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	B	Understand membrane transport and potential	Not specified		Exams	
	C	Understand cellular structure and chemical composition of the body	Not specified	Ch-6	Exams	
	D	Understand the functions of the heart and the circulatory system.	Not specified	Ch-5		
	E	Understand basic respiratory physiology	Not specified	Ch-16		
	F	Comprehend the basic physiology of the muscles and nerves	Not Specified			
	G	Understand regulation of metabolism	Not Specified			
	H	Be aware of blood composition and function	Not Specified			
	I	Be aware of endocrine functions	Not Specified			
	J	Develop an understanding of lag skills related to respiratory and circulatory assessments.	Not Specified			
	K	Understand the value of physiological functions in fitness and wellness.	Not Specified			
Introduction to Health Education KH 2809	1	Discuss at least six of the components of a wellness profile	Eberst Theory Six Dimensions of Health	Reading Assignment, pg. 1-23		
	2	Design a personal program for stress reduction incorporating a knowledge of the three stages of the general adaptation syndrome (GAS) and its physiological manifestations	Seyle's Theory General Adaptation Syndrome	Reading Assignment, pg. 26-51		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	3	Compare and contrast the four basic models of human nature and therapeutic change (biological, behavioral, cognitive and psychoanalytic				
	4	Examine the role self-esteem plays in the ability to form relationships	Maslow's Theory Hierarchy of Needs			
	5	Summarize the hormonal role and the changes that take place in sexual development at embryonic, puberty, and aging phases of development				
	6	Propose at least five characteristics considered in selecting an appropriate contraceptive device	Lecture	Pg. 132-161		
	7	Report at least three infant health problems generating from prenatal use of alcohol and other drugs	Lecture	Pg. 248-271		
	8	Relate the effects of exposure to environmental smoke on the infant's attainment of optimal health	Lecture	Pg. 274-297		
	9	Distinguish at least three physical effects of marijuana, inhalants, and LSD	Lecture	Pg. 216-245		
	10	Explain specific coverage of their individual health insurance policy	Lecture/Group work	Pg. 563-581		
	11	Contrast five medical care plans: Health Maintenance Organization, Point of Service Option, Preferred Provider Organization, Provider-Sponsored Org. Private Fee-For-Service Plan	Lecture/Group work	583-599		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
	12	Differentiate between HDL and LDL cholesterol				
Introduction to Health Education KH 2809	13	Interpret the relationship between diet and cancer risk reduction,	Lecture	Pg. 300-336; 428-457		
	14	Apply knowledge about the transmission of HIV to an individual plan for reduction of risk from infection	Lecture/ Individual Research	Current Research Pg. 486-513		
	15	Describe the four stages of immune response	Insel's Immune Response Theory	Pg. 460-483		
	16	Explain mental and psychological changes which may occur with aging				
	17	Discuss factors which influence biological aging				
	18	Prepare a living will				
	19	Design a plan for self care (personal health)		Pg. 563-581		
	20	Distinguish at least four agencies and organizations at the federal, state and local levels to provide consumers with information about health services				
	21	Explain the multi-causation theory of injury	Insel: Multi-causation Theory of Injury/ Lecture			

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Performance Analysis Area II: Training and Fitness KH 3020	1	Develop knowledge about the benefits of exercise and the principles of safe exercise programs.	Lab Activities	Reading Assignments & Labs	Turn in Completed Labs	
	2	Acquire knowledge about the components of health-and-skill related fitness.	Lab Activities	Reading Assignments & Labs		
	3	Design and participate in a fitness program for him/herself.	Lab Activities	Reading Assignments & Labs	20% of grade	
	4	Design an approp0riate fitness program for another person.	Lab Activities	Reading Assignments & Labs		
	5	Develop ability to conduct fitness tests.	Lab Activities	Reading Assignments & Labs		
	6	Develop knowledge of ways to teach fitness concepts to others.	Lab Activities	Reading Assignments & Labs		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Performance & Analysis Area 3: Team Sports KHKH 3030 *Course syllabus description indicates the course covers 5 sports, but syllabus only covers 3.* *(Included)* *Basketball* *Softball* *Volleyball* *(Not Included)* *Team Handball* *Soccer*	1	Develop knowledge in each sport for all areas listed below: a. equipment b. safety measures c. terminology d. etiquette e. rules f. scoring g. strategy h. cues for skill performance i. ability to analyze skill & strategy performance	None Given	2 internet assignments	None Given	None to compare
	2	Develop knowledge of equipment, materials and resources pertinent to the teaching of these team sports.	None Given			
	3	Acquaint themselves, through participation, wit5h the basic skills and drills helpful for development of physical and mental understanding of the various activities.	None Given			
	4	Develop performance skills for each activity.	None Given			

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	5	Demonstrate competency in the analysis of skills & strategies in each activity.	None Given			
Performance and Analysis Area IV: Lifetime Sports KH 3040	1	Have acquired theoretical/tactical knowledge of tennis, ultimate Frisbee, bowling, and badminton		Web Search- two sources	Written test to assess knowledge of theory, skill, equipment, rules, scoring	
	2	Have developed competence in performing the fundamental skills involved in games of tennis, ultimate Frisbee, bowling and badminton.		Web Search- two sources	Evaluated on personal performance in game situations of each sport.	
	3	Be able to develop instructional lessons to improve the skills of students/athletes with whom you may teach/coach.		Web Search- two sources	In groups, decide on teaching strtegies, including warm-ups, drills, skills, and instructional cues. Develop assessment instrument, giving copies to instructors and peers.	
	4	Be able to evaluate the current level of performance of your students/;athletes		Web Search- two sources		
Performance and Analysis Area V: Lifetime Sports KH 3050	1	Explain the role of adventure activities in relation to the other aspects of physical education and leisure services.	Introduction Lecture			

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	2	Demonstrate knowledge, skills and attitudes desirable for adventure programmers and participants.	• Back packing & camping equipment skills; • Ropes Course groups • Orienteering Instruction • Davidson/Arabia Mountain Park • Challenge Experience • Rock Climbing Expert • Canoeing Experience • Camp-out Experience			
	3	Apply principles of group problem solving to carry out physical and logistical tasks.				
	4	Explain each element, from conception to evaluation, of a trip plan and the timetable of each element.			Trip leaders guide: Camp-out critique, canoeing critique, Skiing critique	
	5	Explain hazard identification and risk management techniques used in adventure programming.			River Canoeing	

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	6	Evaluate the effectiveness of teaching methods used in field trip and class instruction, including strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement.	Lecture: Logistics for Orienteering Field Trip		Personal Performance Assessment	
	7	Explain the procedures used in controlling legal liability in adventure programming.				
Instructional Skills For Health and Physical Education KH 3200	None given	None given	Purpose of physical education; domains of learning; Criteria for learning experiences	pp. 34-40	Quizzes, daily assignments Mid-term & Final Exams Lesson Plans Teaching Performance	
			Pre-teaching			
			Writing Student objectives	pp. 40-41 & handout		
			Writing Student objectives; parts of a lesson	pp. 64,71,84-85,91-92,109-110		
			Parts of a lesson; teach set induction			
			Management & organization of people, space, time & equipment	pp. 63-64, 67-70, 75-76, 82, 90-94		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
			Task presentations; getting/keeping the attention of the learner; selecting and teaching cues	pp. 70-71, 94-102		
			Demonstrations; checking for understanding			
			Teach task presentation			
			Feedback	pp. 102-106		
			Teacher functions during activity			
			Establishing routines & rules	pp. 56-57		
			Minimizing off-task behaviors; discipline systems	pp. 64-68		
			Teaching health			
			Lesson Plans	pp. 112-116, 121-128		
			Off-campus: School site visits			

NO OBJECTIVES LISTED!

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Evaluation and Instrumentation In Physical Education KH 3550	1	To provide the teacher with an understanding of the purposes and uses of the measurement process	Perform Fitnessgram Test Battery	Ch-5 Measure Fitness Domain; Fitness Assessment: Fitness gram Heart Rate & Blood Pressure Measurements		
	2	To provide a basic statistical background with which to compute, interpret and more appropriately evaluate test scores.		Ch-3 Basic statistics, central tendency's variability. Ch-1,2,7; History of Measurement and Evaluation		
	3	To provide a background and knowledge of measuring various physiological, psychological and motor skill parameters.	Perform Fitnessgram Test Battery			
	4	To evaluate various written knowledge testing procedures and methodologies and be able to construct knowledge tests.		Test Design & Construction. Ch-4 Test Evaluation Norms/ Criteria data.		
	5	To provide laboratory experiences in the measurement process in order to increase measurement validity and standardization and in order to learn proper measurement techniques.		Ch-4 Validity, Reliability, & Objectivity		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
	6	To examine and evaluate various grading methodologies and to formulate a sound grading philosophy.		Ch-9 Grading		
Biomechanics KH 3600	1	Develop knowledge of biomechanical principles as they pertain to anatomy and mechanics.		Tests, Quizzes, Labs		
	2	Develop an understanding of linear kinematics and kinetics.	Technology	Tests, Quizzes, Labs		
	3	Develop an understanding of angular kinematics and kinetics.	Technology	Tests, Quizzes, Labs		
	4	Develop an understanding for practical applications of kinesiological principles, etc, in the field. (**instructional strategies, assessment)**		Tests, Quizzes, Labs		
Biomechanics Lab KH 3600	1	Develop knowledge about biomechanical principles related to sport, exercise, occupation, rehabilitation and activities of daily living.	Not Designated	Tentative Schedules		
	2	Develop ability to use and implement biomechanical principles in a qualitative manner.				

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
Motor Learning and Deveopment KH 3610		**NOT GIVEN**		Theoretical Overview and Motor Skills Assessment Task Analysis Physical Fitness Play Gender Roles		
Exercise Physiology KH 3650	1	Develop knowledge of physiological principles.	Throughout whole course (Lectures)	Reading Assignments	Exams I, II, III, IV	
	2	Develop an understanding of the energies responsible for human physical activity.	Energy Metabolism Ch-2 Energy Cost of Exercise			
	3	Develop an understanding of the physiology of circulation and cardiorespiratory functions.	Ch-7; Appendix C Pulmonary Ventilation Ch-9; Cardiovascular Functions			
	4	Become knowledgeable of cardiovascular diseases and risk factors.	Ch-9			
	5	Develop an understanding of the physiology of muscle and nerve functions..	Ch-5,6,13			
	6	Develop an understanding of body composition, diet, and nutrition as related to physical activity and fitness.	Ch-16, Ch-15			

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	7	Develop an understanding of physiological adaptations that occur as a result of training.	Ch-11, Ch-12			
	8	Develop an ability to apply these physiological principles to real life situations.				
Applied Physiology Laboratory KH 3650L	1	To provide students with the opportunity to apply the basic principles of the physiology of exercise.				
	2	To receive practical experience in performing and interpreting the results of select exercise testing procedures				
(TE) Practicum in Health and Physical Education KH 3660	1	Observe and assist experienced teachers in the field of health and physical education	School Visitations Off campus teaching experiences	On-site tasks Interview Assignment	Cooperating teacher evaluation. Critiques/volunteer component	(vaguely, yes)
	2	Interact with teachers concerning appropriate health and physical education curricula, teaching methods and strategies.	School Visitations Off campus teaching experiences	On-site tasks	Cooperating teacher evaluation. Critiques/volunteer component	(vaguely, yes)
	3	Develop an increased awareness of learners' characteristics – emotional, physical, mental, cultural and ethnicity in addition to their needs, abilities, and interests.	School Visitations Off campus teaching experiences	On-site tasks	Cooperating teacher evaluation. Critiques/volunteer component	(vaguely, yes)

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	4	Develop an awareness of the diversity of school settings within the Atlanta metropolitan area. **(Instructional strategies, assessment, cultural diversity, exceptional learners). Program Theme: "Educator as critical and divergent thinker".**	School Visitations Off campus teaching experiences	On-site tasks	Cooperating teacher evaluation. Critiques/ volunteer component	(vaguely, yes)
Curriculum and Instruction For Pre- and Elementary Physical Education KH 4510	1	Students will become familiar with the major contextual factors that influence pre-and elementary physical education programming: a. Diverse student populations **(cultural diversity, instructional strategies)** b. Students with disabilities **(cultural diversity, instructional strategies).** c. Professional and paraprofessional staffs **(use of paraprofessionals).** d. Equipment and facilities		Application of four (4) teaching models in instructional skills assignment Assigned Readings	25 points per model	

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
	2	Students will become familiar with several innovative teaching models for elementary physical education: **(instructional strategies)** a. Direct Instruction b. Concepts-based – Inquiry Model c. Peer-Teaching Model d. Tactical Games e. Cooperative Learning		Application of four (4) teaching models in instructional skills assignment Assigned Readings	25 points per model	
	3	Students will refine discrete teaching skills for effective pre and elementary instruction: **(instructional strategies)** a. Classroom management techniques b. Content presentation and modeling c. Clear and accurate communication with learners d. Lesson Planning e. Planning for safe learning environments f. Delivery of effective feedback to learners g. Lesson Closure h. Self-assessment of teaching Other		Students will develop18 lesson plans per group related to specific teaching models and tasks. Assigned Readings	Submit for evaluation at end of course.	

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Curriculum and Instruction For Pre- and Elementary Physical Education KH 4510	4	Students will learn to apply the following concepts as they relate to pre and elementary physical education: **(instructional strategies)** a. Developmentally appropriate content b. Developmentally appropriate teaching practices c. Instructional design d. Authentic assessment **(assessment)** e. Reflective teaching f. Research-based effective teaching behaviors **(research activity)** g. Content development h. Systematic analysis i. Teaching for social responsibility		Assigned Readings		
	5	Students will learn to use instructional videotapes in analyzing and assessing their lesson. **(Technology, self assessment of teaching)**		Students will be videotaped as part of final course evaluation		
	6	Students will incorporate at least one aspect of multi cultural teaching in their lesson plans and curriculum project. **(Instructional strategies, cultural diversity)**				

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	7	Students will demonstrate ability to include strategies for working with students with different exceptionalities. **(Instructional strategies, exceptional children, cultural diversity)**				
Curriculum & Instruction for Secondary Physical Education (Comp. # 2833) KH 4520	1	Students will become familiar with major contextual factors that influence secondary physical education programs.	NASPE Standards			
	2	Students will learn how to plan for developmentally appropriate instruction for secondary physical education.				
	3	Students will continue to develop a repertoire of effective teaching skills for secondary physical education.				
	4	Students will develop and implement a scope and sequence of instruction				
	5	Students will become familiar with several models of instruction for secondary physical education.	• Effective Teaching Models • Cooperative Learning Model • PE Curriculum Model		Curriculum model project.	

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
	6	Students will plan and implement model-based instruction	• Effective Teaching Models • Cooperative Learning Model • PE Curriculum Model	Develop 5 graded lessons.	Curriculum model project.	
	7	Students will learn and employ alternative and authentic assessment techniques for secondary physical education	• Fitness Testing • Fitness Interviewing			
Methods and Materials: Health Education (Comp. # 2836) KH 4530 **(Skill Based)**	1	**(Knowledge Based)**				
		Students will develop five, age/stage appropriate, health lessons which incorporate a variety of teaching strategies and promote health literacy through the inclusion of critical thinking, problem-solving, and effective communication skills		Students will write 5 lesson plans	Submit 5 lesson plans @ 20 points each	Yes

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Methods and Materials: Health Education (Comp. # 2836) KH 4530	6	Retrieve valid health information from a variety of on-line directories and search engines and databases located within GSU specific library search engines.		Incorporate an internet source into a health lesson		
	7	Design, produce and mount a topic-related transparency with overlay including graphics and text and integrate this transparency into the teaching of a lesson incorporating several teaching methods.		Produce overlay using Power Point Software		
	8	Design and produce a student handout to complement the transparency and overlay		Design a handout with Power Point Software		
	9	Be a peer reviewer of health lessons written by a peer partner and critique the teaching presentation of a peer partner.		Critique 5 peer lesson plans		
	10	Organize a health lesson plan around results of a student interest survey and inclusive of the seven components of a lesson plan as described by Madeline Hunter.		Complete 5 reflection assignments		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	11	Integrate selected portions of software material from Pyramid Challenge, the Magic School Bus and the Human Body, ADAM, or DINE Healthy 3 into an age/stage appropriate lesson component.		Incorporate an internet source into a health lesson	Incorporate an internet source into a health lesson	
	12	Incorporate the use of teaching and student masters into teaching strategies for K-12 health education.		Produce overlay using Power Point Software;	Produce overlay using Power Point Software;	
	13	On a selected health topic, produce and present a six minute still-frame videotape program containing at least 40 different images; and			Final Exam (Still-frame videotape Presentation)	
	14	Reflect on personal growth attributed to health planning/teaching experience.		Complete 5 reflection assignments	Complete 5 reflection assignments	
	15	Demonstrate the ability to incorporate a variety of teaching methods in planning learning activities.				
Methods and Materials: Health Education (Comp. # 2836) KH 4530	16	Conduct a topic/content search specific to a selected health topic using 0n-line library search engines and the School Health and Safety web page.		Incorporate a portion of a health related CD ROM into a health lesson	Incorporate a portion of a health related CD ROM into a health lesson	

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
	17	Apply knowledge of fair use guidelines for copyright specific to teacher development of materials.				
	18	Write learning objectives, which demonstrate knowledge of the levels of cognitive domain, appropriate for various ages and stages.		Write 5 lesson plans	Write 5 lesson plans	
	19	Use a variety of discipline skills to effectively manage the learning environment.				
	20	Design methods and materials in health education which appreciate multi-cultural and multi-ethnic diversity.				
	21	Administer and interpret a student interest survey for health education lesson planning.				
Curriculum and Instruction for Adapted and Inclusive Physical Education KH 4540	1	Students will have acquired knowledge of disabilities and conditions commonly found in schools.		• Reading assignments • Video's • Sex Education • Individual Education Programs (IEP) • Mental Retardation		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match-up"
				• Down Syndrome • Autism • Physical Disabilities • Hearing Impairments • Visual Impairments • Behavior Management • Learning Disabilities		
	2	Students will be able to apply a variety of instructional techniques and approaches that influence performance of students with disabilities in physical education.		• Reading Assignments • Peer evaluation Assignments • Inclusive games • IEP		
	3	Students will be able to develop and organize a physical education program to include individuals with disabilities in regular physical education programs.		• Inclusive games • School related sport		
Curriculum and Instruction for Adapted and Inclusive Physical Education KH 4540	4	Students will be able to assess the motor performance of students with disabilities in physical education using a variety of measures.		Report topics: • Nature of disability • Type of instruction • Instructional adaptations		

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Opening School Experience in Health & Physical Education KH 4650	1	Student teachers will be able to identify the organizational structure of the school.	Investigate to learn answers to questions posed in course syllabus.		*Attendance of two full days and 6 additional hours at each school placement and all scheduled seminars. **All absences must be made up.** * Maintain the schedule followed by the cooperating teacher. Includes assisting the Cooperating teacher in all appropriate situations. * Professional conduct and dress appropriate for a full member of the school staff.	
	2	Student teachers will be able to identify the management and discipline techniques				
	3	Student teachers will be able to identify classroom organization and instruction.				
	4	Student teachers will be able to identify the student population of the school.				
	5	Student teachers will be able to identify parent involvement in the school.				

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
					*Satisfactory completion of School Policies Assessments for each school. Maintain a time log of attendance for course verification by the cooperating teacher.	
Student Teaching in Health & Physical Education P-12 KH 4660	1	Each student will observe and assist experienced teachers in the field of health & physical education.				
	2	.Each student will plan and implement an effective curriculum for health and physical education.				
	3	Each student will participate in self-evaluation for the purpose of assessing strength and weaknesses.				
	4	Each student will demonstrate the ability to utilize a variety of teaching methods, teaching modes and strategies.				
	5	Each student will develop an increased awareness of learners' characteristics-emotional, physical, mental, cultural and ethnical in addition to their needs, abilities and interests.				

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Do Components "match- up"
Student Teaching in Health & Physical Education P-12 **Capstone Seminar** **KH 4700**	1	**Each student will observe and assist experienced teachers in the field of health & physical education.**			* **Initial plan of Involvement E** * Initial plan of Involvement S * Reflection Tasks #1-6	
	2	Each student will plan and implement an effective curriculum for health and physical education.			* Health Reflection Assignments (3) * Field-Based Health Lessons (3): Instructor Critique of Teaching (KH 4530)	
	3	Each student will participate in self-evaluation for the purpose of assessing strengths and weaknesses.			* Lesson Video Tape Assignments 1 & 2 * Review of Taped Lessons 1 & 2 * Planning and Content	

Appendix E (Continued)

Course Name Course Number	Objective	Specific Objective	Coordinated Learning Experience	Coordinated Course Assignments	Evaluation Criteria	Da Components "match- up"
	4	Each student will demonstrate the ability to utilize a variety of teaching methods, teaching modes and strategies.			* HPE Teaching Models Assignment * Evaluation of students Instructional Skills	
	5	Each student will develop an increased awareness of learners' characteristics-emotional, physical, mental, cultural and ethnical in addition to their needs, abilities and interests.			* Professionalism/ Assignments	

** Additional Evaluation Criteria not specific to the objectives addressed:

- Student Teaching Time Log
- Courtesy Notes
- Clearance from school; returning all borrowed materials, Application Cert. (COE), Taking Praxis II, Application and interviews.
- Follow-up: Certificate received, alumni office notified of completion, notify HPE program chair of location for next year.

APPENDIX F

Grade Distribution Across Courses

Course Number	A's	B's	C's	D's	F's	W's	S's	No grade
KH 101	6					1		
KH 222	2	20	17	8	3	3		
KH 223	6	20	5	2	1	1		
KH 238	6	1						
KH 300	15	7						
KH 301	21	13	1			1		
KH 302	28	13				1		
KH 303	26	9						
KH 313	22	20	1			1		1
KH 320	17	27	6	1		1		
KH 328	53	6				3		
KH 339	34	8	1					
KH 340	28	21	3	2				
KH 344	3							
KH 345	2							
KH 350	1	1		1		1		
KH 351	5	2						
KH 353	7	2				1		
KH 366	37	9						
KH 367	37	3				1		
KH 422	2	3	2					
KH 428 (1997)		1						
KH 429 (1997)	1							
KH 439 (1996)	1							
KH 440	31	13	5					
KH 450	8	16	15	3		2		
KH 451	24	10	3					
KH 452	28	9						
KH 453	33	7	2					
KH 454	37	6	1			1	1	
KH 455	8	24	15					
KH 460	2	23	19	2		3		
KH 462							35	
KH 463 (1996)	1							
KH 464	4							
KH 466	32	3						
KH 469	35							

Appendix F (Continued)

Course Number	A's	B's	C's	D's	F's	W's	S's	No grade
KH 475 (1997)	1							
KH 476 (1997)	1							
KH 481	7							
KH 481A	2							
KH 2130	1							
KH 2230								1
KH 3000	1							
KH 3010	2							
KH 3390 (1999)	1							
KH 3550		1						
KH 3600			2					
KH 3650		2	2			1		
KH 3660	2							
KH 4510	5	4	3					
KH 4520	8	4						
KH 4530	7	5						
KH 4540	12							
KH 4650							13	2
KH 4660	8	4						3
KH4700	10							2
KH 7250								1
HPRD 101						1		
238	1	2				1		
239	1							
301		1						
302		1						
303		1						
328	1							
340		2						
350		2						
422		1	1					
428		2			1	1		
429			1					
439		1						
450		1				1		
455		1	1	1				
460		2						
463		1	1	1				
465		1						
475	2							
476	2							
481	1							
HPRD 101						1		
238	1	2				1		
239	1							
301		1						
302		1						

Appendix F (Continued)

Course Number	A's	B's	C's	D's	F's	W's	S's	No grade
303		1						
328	1							
340		2						
350		2						
422		1	1					
428		2			1	1		
429			1					
439		1						
450		1				1		
455		1	1	1				
460		2						
463		1	1	1				
465		1						
475	2							
476	2							
481	1							
HPRS 101						2		
102		1			2			
301			1					
302	1							
303		1						
313		1						
340		2						
352		2						
353		2						
366		2				1		
367						1		
368								
444		1						
450		1	1					
455			1	2				
460		2						
465	1							

REFERENCES

Agar, M. H., & Hobbs, J. R. (1981). Interpreting discourse: Coherence and the analysis of ethnographic interview. Discourse Processes, 5, 1-32.

American Federation of Teachers. (2000). Resolutions: Teacher education and teacher quality. [Online]. Available: http://www.aft.org/about/resolutions/2000/teacher edandeval.html.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1974). Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Alkin, M., Daillak, R., & White, P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference? Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Barnes, H. (1987). The conceptual bases for thematic teacher education programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(4), 13-17.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). Qualitative research in education: An Introduction to theory and methods. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Broudy, H. S. (1980). What do professors of education profess? The Educational Forum, 44(4), 441-51.

Buchmann, M., & Floden, R. E. (1990). Program coherence in teacher education: A view from the United States. Michigan: The National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Cronbach, L. & Associates. (1980). Toward reform of program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Eisner, E. W., & Peshkin, A. (Eds.). (1991). Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. New York: Macmillan.

Galluzo, G. R., & Craig, J. R. (1990). Evaluation of preservice teacher education programs. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 599-616). New York: Macmillan.

Gov (Ed.). (1993). Webster's new international dictionary (3rd ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam Webster Inc.

Gredler, M. E. (1996). Program evaluation. New Jersey: Merrill, an imprint of Prentice Hall.

Harding University. (2000). Conceptual framework. [Online]. Available: http:// www.harding.edu/education/concept-frame.html.

Hickok, E. W. (1998). Higher standards for teacher training. Policy Review, 91, 6-8.

Howey, K. R., & Zimpher, N. L. (1989). Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Indiana University Bulletin School of Education, Undergraduate Program. (2000-2002). Academic bulletin, new programs in teacher education at Bloomington. [Online]. Available: http://www.indiana.edu/bulletin/inbleduc-ug/2000-2002/new programs.html; www.runinfo.indiana.edu/homepages/050898/text/principles.html.

Ingersoll, R. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality: The recurring myth of teacher shortages. Teacher College Record, 99, 41-44.

Ingersoll, R. (1998). The problem of out-of-field teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 79, 773-776.

Kezar, E. J. (2000). Higher education trends (1997-1999) curriculum. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). George Washington University, Department of Education.

Koehler, V. (1985). Research in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 23-30.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). Methods of educational & social science research: An integrated approach (2nd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd edition, pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Lawson, H. A. (1983). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education (Part I). Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 2, 3-16.

Lawson, H. A. (1986). Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5, 107-116.

Leonard, D., & Gleeson, J. (1999). Context and coherence in initial teacher education in Ireland: The place of reflective inquiry. Teacher Development, 3(1).

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McEneaney, J. E., & Sheridan, E. M. (1993, May). Evaluating the effectiveness of an undergraduate teacher education Program. (ED358062).

Metzler, M., & Tjeerdsma, B. L. (1998). PETE program assessment within a development, research, and improvement framework. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17, 468-492.

Mitchell, M. (2000). Assessing PETE program coherence. In M. W. Metzler & B. L. Tjeerdsma (Eds.), Assessment of physical education teacher education programs (pp. 113-128). Reston, VA: NASPE.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (1995). National standards for beginning physical education teachers. Reston, VA: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

O'Day, J., Goertz, M. E., & Floden, R. E. (1995). Building capacity for education reform. Center on Policy Research in Education. [Online]. Available: http:// www.ed.gov/pubs/cpre/rb181.

Patton, M. Q. (1978). Utilization focused evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. D. (1983). Effective schools: A review. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 427-452.

Raths, S. D., & Katz, L. G. (1985). Teacher dispositions as goals for teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.

Russell, T., & McPherson, S. (2001). Indicators of success in teacher education: A revision and analysis of recent research. 2001 Pan-Canadian Education Research Agenda Symposium - Teacher Education/Education Training: Current Trends and Future Directives. LaVal University, Quebec City.

Scriven, M. (1981). Evaluation thesaurus (3rd ed.). Inverness, CA: Edgepress.

Sprinthall, N. A., & Theis-Sprinthall, L. (1983). The need for theoretical frameworks in educating teachers: A cognitive-developmental perspective. In K. R. Howey & W. E. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers: A look ahead (pp. 74-97). New York: Longman.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1982). Explorations in the evaluation of teacher education. In S. M. Hord, T.V. Savage, & L. J. Bethel (Eds.), Toward usable strategies for teacher education program evaluation (pp. 131-168). Austin, TX: University of Texas, R & D Center for Teacher Education.

Tyler, R. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

University of Northern Colorado College of Education. (2002). Professional education at the university of northern Colorado. [Online]. Available: www.coe.edu/doans/profeducation.html.

Weiner, G. (1999). Swedish teacher education at the crossroads. Umek University, Sweden. [Online]. Available: http://www.2educ.umu.sel~gaby/swedish-teacher-education.html.

Zimpher, N. L., & Loadman, W. E. (1986). A documentation and assessment system for student and program development. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.